Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. MARCH 1928.

YOUTH AND OUR EVANGELICAL CHURCH

Prof. Henry Katterjohn

The observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of our Evangelical League brought into the focus of our attention the fact, that there has been and still is a "Youth Movement" in our Evangelical Synod. An anniversary always furnishes an opportunity for a comparison of the present with the past. The reports submitted in the form of a "Historical Review" offered ample evidence that our "Youth Movement" has not been without a definite and determining influence upon the development and character of our Evangelical Church. We believe that within these past twenty-five years our spiritual life has been deepened, our interests and activities broadened, the whole church as such brought into a more or less definite conscious relationship to the great problems confronting civilization at large and our own nation in particular. The increasing number of memorials and contributions of our Evangelical League to the great enterprises of our Evangelical Church, which were a characteristic feature of our youth activities from the beginning, are symbolical of our growing interest and loyalty of our young people in and to the cause of the Kingdom of God.

A comparison between the "now" and "then" of our Evangelical League bids us to make a comparison between the movement within our own church, and the "Youth Movement" in Germany.

The movement in Germany was a protest against purposive suppression and ignoring of youth on part of the Church, and was

therefore revolutionary in character. The movement culminated in a great many instances in a direct attempt to break away from the traditional moorings, and launch out upon the unexplored waters of a new religious and social experimentation. The erratic and oft-times phantastic forms which the "Youth Movement" assumed in Germany can be understood only if we interpret them as an open protest against imposed adult supervision and control, and an attempt on the part of the young people to live and function on the level of youth capacity and interest. They tried to discover the dominating interests and normal activities in which young people seeking the Jesus way of living, might normally engage. Undoubtedly mistakes were made, but on the whole the movement did accomplish its end in so far as it emphasized anew the great objective of all religious organization, to provide for an environment in which all, adults and young people and children can have an experience of God. In spite of, or perhaps because of its negative character, this movement did have this positive result. The "Youth Movement" in Germany had as its aim the breaking of the chains of imposed adult control, and the recognition of the right of youth to religious experience commensurate with youth needs and capacity, or in other words, self-realization of the young people.

Our "Youth Movement" sprang from a different motive. The entire young people's movement in America originated from a desire on the part of youth to appropriate and share adult religious experience. The early Christian Endeavor Societies were content to pattern their organization and activities after those of adult forms. Their prayer meetings were adult prayer meetings of a modified type; their committees and even their pledge were taken over from the form of church pledges and church activities. The whole of the Christian Endeavor organization was a miniature of the adult forms. The underlying motive was the desire to arrive at maturity and adulthood as quickly as possible, and for this reason adult forms were retained, and adult experiences copied.

But in seeking this end they failed to experience a continuity of growth in religious experience; there was a decided break in their development. The importance of living and functioning normally at all times, and in all phases of life activities was overlooked.

For this reason our "Youth Movement" which in our Evangelical Church found expression in the Evangelical League, never broke away from the traditional moorings, but used these as an anchorage to stabilize their work, and as a starting place from which they might depart. The movement did not pass through the Storm and Stress experience, that cataclysmic emotional upheaval that has

been characteristic of the German movement. Our young people always welcomed adult leadership and guidance. Perhaps this tendency to link up with adult experience retarded the process of self-realization, but it did bring youth and adults of our Evangelical Church closer together than would have been otherwise possible had antagonism marked their activities. Adults and youth learned how to work together, and in the process of working and living togehter, each made important contributions to the sum total of their experiences, enriching and improving the living process of both.

After all, is this not the desired attitude we must have towards each other? The Kingdom of God is not a complex of diverse elements, but a cooperative enterprise where all age levels meet their needs, and succeed in living to their fullest capacity.

What has the Church as such learned through its contact with young people?

There are five distinct stages in the development of the attitude of the Church towards her young people.

1. The first stage is marked by the *absolute dominance of adulthood,* and *corresponding ignoring of youth.* In this stage human civilization was regarded as existing for the sake of the adults. Adult life is the only worth while life, childhood and youth cannot be evaded, but are to be deplored, and the goal of adulthood must be reached as rapidly as possible. Life was organized as a civilization for such as had arrived at maturity. The institutions, of our civilization, such as government, school, church, are the tools through which those who have arrived at maturity can retain their power to control life situations. Only adulthood assured a rich and abundant life, the life of the child and youth was incomplete, therefore lacking in richness and abundance.

2. The second stage is marked by the *awakening of adult life to the actuality of youth.* Youth is here, *what shall we do with it?* When in the days of the Reformation the religious foundations of beliefs and forms of church organization were shaken to their very depths, and the whole carefully reared structure of church authority was undermined, when the necessity confronted the church to find reenforcement in numbers and followers, then they turned to youth and sought to train them in the ways of the fathers in order that the traditional heritage of the past might be preserved and handed down intact to the coming ages. Luther and the reformers answered the question: "What shall we do with youth?" by founding schools for their instruction, by developing rites in which the rights of youth as an integral part of the whole social fabric were recognized. The Catholic Church responded by the counter-reformation, during which period its school system for children and

youth was created. This recognition of youth as an integral factor in social organization culminated in our public school system, created and supported primarily for the purpose of preserving the heritage of the past, and assuring an unbroken continuity of our civilization. This recognition of youth as an integral part of the human family was accompanied by a long intense searching, covering four hundred years of experimentation and research, after a teaching technique whose observance and practice might facilitate the passing on of this heritage of the human race, the rich experiences and accomplishments of the past. The increasing complexity of human living made this quest after an effective teaching method a most perplexing, yes, almost a fruitless one. The story of Luther, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Commenius, John Locke and Herbart is the tale of such ardent seeking after means and methods through which youth might be trained in the ways of the fathers, and the heritage of their experiences be preserved unimpaired and unsoiled.

3. The third stage on the relationship of adult to youth is marked by the question: *"What can we do for youth?"* This period might be termed an aftermath of the great struggle which the Civil War involved. In public school education it led to the definite adoption of the free common school system by all of our states; the founding of denominational colleges, the State Universities, and other institutions of learning and training which were factors in equipping youth better for life. The great sacrifice of young manhood, which the Civil War involved, aroused in our citizenship a feeling of appreciation and reverence for youth. The Church also woke up to a consciousness of her responsibility. She felt a compassion for her young people. It was the age of honest altruistic endeavor. We began to lavish affection upon her youth. So-called Institutional Churches providing opportunities for play and recreation were built; religion was made more attractive to young people through the sugar-coating of sensuous pleasures, which resulted not only in a cheapening of religious values, but in the deterioration of religious living as well. The feeling was abroad, that if we would hold our young people for the church, and win them for the religion of Jesus, we must make religion easy for youth.

The result was rather disappointing. Instead of winning youth, we estranged them; instead of strengthening their character, we weakened and demoralized them; instead of enriching their lives, we pauperized them, preventing from having that rich experience that a genetic contact with Jesus alone can give. The enlarged educational opportunities, the scientific approach which was encountered everywhere, the keen competition of commercialized recreational interests, gave our young people not only a different view-

point of life, too often in entire contrast to religious attitudes, but caused them to regard the church as inferior when compared with these other agencies that were engaging their interests. The policy of doing something for young people did not work, it only retarded their growth and developed an attitude of pitying indifference towards the church.

4. The fourth stage is marked by the question: *"What can young people do?"* This was the period of emancipation. There is an attitude of disregard of existing institutions such as the family and the church, a breaking down of discipline. Owing to the increasing complexities of living, the incoming of multiplying interests, parents and leaders felt themselves incompetent to hold taut the reins of discipline. The contact with new viewpoints, the experience of new values, aroused in youth itself a feeling of competency, which looked with disregard upon the experiences and wisdom of a former age. Youth questioned existing social attitudes, customs, traditions, traditional thinking. It is the spirit of youth to challenge the past to fit into the conditions of today, and is applied ruthlessly in every field of human endeavor—in education and religion, economic organization, government, marriage, the family relationship. This tendency to question and disregard authority has led to conflicts, resulting, on the one hand in the disintegration of ethical conduct, the breaking down of morals, the creation of "flappers and sheiks," juvenile delinquency—in religious life we see the breaking down of the old time faith, the glorification of doubt and unbelief; on the other hand we see the despair of the adult leaders, who feel their impotency to cope with the new spirit, and as a result relinquish the attempt to lead. Youth has been in open rebellion against adult leadership. We see it in the students conferences held from time to time, where a sharp cleavage was drawn between youth and adults, indicated in the inhibition of adult counsel and advice. The demand to live their life in the light of their own experience is leading, to excesses which old traditions cannot sanction. The extreme results of this life philosophy are the cigarette smoking girl and the hip-flask-carrying-youth. These are signs of emancipation, and are used not because of their inherent value, but because they signify independence. We have let go of youth because we were unable to impose upon them our adult experience. Not being able to cope with the situation we have adopted a "laissez-faire" policy, "let things drift, all will be well in the end."

But all will not be well. We dare not permit youth to be divorced from adult leadership, or separated and isolated from the sacred heritage and culture of the past. We must adopt a new policy, or attitude towards youth.

5. *We must live with youth,* if we would direct youth. The writer was impressed by a statement made this last summer by a leader of the German Youth Movement. Resenting the attempt of adults to impose their adult experience upon youth, he made the following statement in answer to a question regarding the age of those participating in the Youth Movement, "Of course, the Youth Movement includes also men of advanced age, for we welcome young old people who are ready to live with us." It is not true that youth resents adult leadership. Youth is conscious of its limitations. It has a paucity of experiences, and therefore is lacking the materials out of which general principles are constructed. Conscious of its poverty, youth looks towards a leadership that can supply its wants, and led youth to a more abundant living. But that leadership must be on the level of youth, organically integrated, not separate and distinct, or segmentally differentiated. We adults must live with youth, share her experiences, appreciate, not patronizingly, but sincerely, naturally and automatically, youth's life values. This period of this new adult relationship to youth is just being ushered in. It took the world two thousand years to discover the meaning of Jesus' words; "Except ye become as a little child, ye cannot enter the Kingdom of heaven." Except we become an integrated part of youth life we cannot guide youth's development. There is no segmental development of life, the law of continuity is in effect. We are just beginning to realize that the great human family consists not of mature adults and immature children, but of men, women, youth and children who are all in the process of becoming. We believe in the democracy of God, we must learn to live with each other and for each other.

The result is a change in the definition of religion. Religion is not something external, a matter of intellectual belief, a compliance with certain forms and symbols, but an inner attitude springing from life experiences. There is a change in the definition of the church. It is no longer the adult experience that is the mark of a real Christian. The church is an environment in which every one can have an experience of God, in accordance with his need and capacity. And for the creation of such an environment all of us are necessary, adults, youth and children. We must enable every one to have an experience of God, and this experience is complete at every age level, perfect in degree, providing it measures up to the fullest capacity of the individual. To make this possible we must live with each other, enter into each other's problems not only with sympathy and understanding, but actually, and really, as if they were our problems; appreciate each others needs and interests, live

on the level of love and friendship or gain unity and cooperation. This organic unity of all is necessary in order that the fulness of God may be revealed in the hearts of all, men, women, youth and children.

After all, the experience and guidance of maturity is necessary for the proper growth of youth. We cannot build a Christian society without it. Neither does youth seek to escape this guidance. Modern emancipated youth is not "all right". There is evident a trend towards disintegration which is alarming because it indicates social and moral anarchy. Youth wishes an abundant, orderly way of living.

How can this unity be brought about between youth and adult leadership, involving the acceptance of adult experience?

As a Christian society, we must,

1. Provide for an opportunity to youth to gain a knowledge of this world, the rich heritage of past traditions and experiences, the life situations and life problems involved in the process of livin. Youth must have a concept of reality and truth, must *know life,* living the past as well as the present.

2. We must provide for an opportunity to test out the value of these experiences in the actual living process, that on the basis of what is best youth may create an ideal of what the world ought to be like. This is the concept of the beautiful, the desirable, the ideal. Youth must be helped to *feel* the appeal and value of beautiful living.

3. We must help youth attach such a value to the ideal, that it will so *mold and construct its conduct,* that the world as it is will become the world as it ought to be. This is ethical conduct, the Jesus Way of living.

Youth must have well developed concepts of truth, beauty, and conduct. We must help youth to *know,* to *feel* and to *will* to do that what is in harmony with these two. This is the environment youth must live in, if it is to grow into the righteousness of God, and such an environment can be created only through the process of actually living together on basis of inner unity and cooperation.

The influence springing from this process of living together is not only directed towards the changing or transformation of youth. It also has its effect upon maturity, for maturity is still a process of developing and growing; it is far from being stable and fixed state. In this process of living together youth exerts influence upon maturity, and this is its best and largest contribution that it ultimately will make towards the enriching of the living process. We shall enumerate a few of these contributions without an attempt to be all-inclusive.

1. Youth has discovered the fact, that Christian living is a quest after a better understanding of Jesus Christ. The unsearchable riches of Jesus, steadily unfolding as life progresses, but never quite comprehended, are a challenge to the adventurous spirit of youth, which youth cannot resist. As long as we have not fully comprehended or discovered Jesus, Christian living will ever remain an adventure. The challenge "Come and See," is ever with us. There need be no fear of ever exhausting the mind and power of the challenge of Jesus. The world is turning to Jesus, and youth is going with the world. The fear of the church, as it was, will be forgotten in appreciation of the church which is seeking to provide all with a living contact with the life and experience of the fulness of Jesus.

2. Youth is kindling idealism in adulthood. Adulthood had become fixed and stable in its outlook upon life, as expressed in dogma and forms of belief. Like the church of the Middle Ages, we had no problems, all was settled. Tradition, we said, if preserved, shows the way to successful living. We thought we had comprehended Jesus, understood him perfectly. Youth's enthusiasm over the new discovery of Jesus aroused the dogmatic adult, and he has joined the host of adventurous seekers after Jesus who are discovering the astounding fact that no one has fully comprehended Jesus. He is actually the man, "whom nobody knows." Hitherto we have been satisfied with the existing words of Jesus, now we are trying to discover the lost words of Jesus, the implications involved in his sayings as applied to present day situations. Youth is challenging the world in this adventure of discovery.

3. Youth is preparing the way *for the democracy of God,* the democratizing of the whole world. The concepts "Internationalism," "World Friendship," "World Peace," "Interracial Good-will" are not satisfactory because they do not express the nature of this new world attitude completely. In their very nature they involve differentiation, existing differences, compromises. In the light of Jesus' teachings there exists a "oneness," an organic unity to such a degree that all individualism is lost sight of in the divine unity culminating in God. The consciousness of being "children" of the one "heavenly Father" is essential before we can really have a democracy or Kingdom of God on earth.

4. Youth is preparing the way for a *Christian civilization.* This civilization will be realized not through a revolution, but is a process of steady development and growth. Interpreting the past in the light of present day experiences, we shall widen the influence of Jesus until it embraces all phases of living, and gives direction to all human institutions. This is primarily the task of youth, through

its "growing into life" process. The ultimate Christianizing of business, government, social relations, educational institutions, etc., is not impossible, but ultimately possible in the light of the advancements that have been made in this direction.

5. Youth is demonstrating the meaning of a social gospel, of an order of living in which Jesus is still the leader and source of power for the individual, but where the experience of the individual is linked up with the experience of others and becomes the common stimulus and urge of all, so that all live with each other and for each other in and through the indwelling of the spirit of Jesus Christ. Thus the world shall be saved from the sin of individualism and self-centeredness, and life find its fullest expression through service and sacrifice. "That I might know Him, and the Power of His resurrection" must become the urge, the inner drive of youth.

Youth is seeking, inspite of its freakish conduct, inspite of its errings and wanderings, the abundant life.

Let us join youth, and with youth find the way to the understanding of Jesus.

Living with youth is the only answer to the problem of youth.

EVALUATION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

By Prof. Philip Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D.

That famous little book, the Heidelberg catechism, should be much better known by the ministers of our Evangelical Synod than it is, mainly for three reasons. In the first place, because it is one of the three official creedal standards of our synod. Article II of the recently revised constitution of our denomination reads:

"The Evangelical Synod of North America, as a part of the Evangelical Church, defines the term 'Evangelical Church' as denoting that branch of the Christian Church which acknowledges the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the Word of God, the sole and infallible guide of faith and life, and accepts the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures as given in the symbolic books of the Lutheran and the Reformed Church, the most important being: The Augsburg Confession, Luther's and *the Heidelberg Catechisms,* in so far as they agree; but where they disagree The Evangelical Synod of North America adheres strictly to the passages of Holy Scriptures bearing on the subject, and avails itself of the liberty of conscience prevailing in the Evangelical Church."

A second reason why our ministers should acquaint themselves better with the Heidelberg catechism is the increasing sentiment in our Synod in favor of a closer cooperation with the Reformed Church in the United States, commonly called the "German Reformed Church" (in distinction from the *Dutch* Reformed Church), whose sole official creed is the Heidelberg catechism. Article 7 of the constitution of that denomination declares: "A congregation of the Reformed Church in the U. S. is a body of Christians accepting the Bible as the Word of God and the *Heidelberg Catechism* as its standard of faith and doctrine." These statements of both denominations would at the outset offer a common confessional platform for some kind of an effective union between the two churches. Moreover, the Heidelberg Catechism should be known for its own sake, for it is a treasure-house of devotional, theological and homiletical material for the immediate use of ministers. I would therefore urge my younger brethren in the ministry to set apart the forenoons of one or more weeks for a careful reading of the little book, on the basis of this introductory essay, and I will assure them of a considerable amount of inspiration, as well as good texts, seed thoughts and outlines for many a strong sermon.

Reasons for Writing the Heidelberg Catechism

These may best be stated in the form of a brief history of the Reformation in the Palatinate (Pfalz). This country was late in introducing church reforms, though the people were impatient for

them. Finally while the Elector, Frederick II, was still counseling with Melanchthon, the people forced matters. On Sunday, December 20, 1545, when the priest was just preparing to read mass in the Church of the Holy Ghost at Heidelberg, they arose en masse and drowned the priest's voice by singing that stirring Reformation choral: "Es ist das Heil uns kommen her." The priest left the altar, and the Elector acquiesced in the will of the people. On December 25, 1545, in the Castle Chapel, and on January 3, 1546 (six weeks before Luther's death on February 18, 1546), in the Church of the Holy Ghost, the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the Protestant way. After many ups and downs, the succeding Elector, Otto Henry, established the Reformation on a firmer basis by introducing the Church Order of 1556. The type of Protestantism in the Palatinate was a mild Melanchthonian Lutheranism, although men of Zwinglian and Calvinistic leanings were also appointed as professors and preachers. Among the Lutherans was Heshusius, the General Superintendent, a High-Lutheran zealot who soon attacked the Calvinists with great violence, calling the University "a hellish, devilish, cursed, cruel and terrible thing" and excommunicating his Reformed colleague, Prof. Klebitz.

When in 1559, Frederick III, the Pious, ascended the throne he inherited also this quarrel. Born a Roman Catholic, he had become a Lutheran through the influence of his excellent wife, the daughter of the Markgrave of Brandenburg. But he became gradually estranged from Lutheranism, (1) on account of the fanatical violence of Heshusius, whom he finally dismissed, and (2) because his careful study of the Bible and other books had convinced him that Zwingli and Calvin represented a more Biblical, spiritual and ethical type of Protestantism, and that Lutheranism itself was in dire need of a new reformation. The Lutheran party became so alarmed that the Elector's own wife asked her son-in-law, the Elector of Saxony, to have prayers said in his churches that God might keep Frederick in the "true faith." But in 1560 he had already accepted Melanchthon's "consensus formula" on the Lord's Supper and after the Naumburg Diet, in 1561, the veneration of the Virgin, the adoration of the host, Lenten rules, images, altars, baptismal fonts, and even organs were abolished, and bread was substituted for the wafer. He also insisted on a more thorough ethical reformation which should manifest itself in love, tolerance, purity, temperance, etc. As Dr. Geo. W. Richards in his recent book on the Heidelberg Catechism, puts it: "The term 'Reformed' had its point turned against Lutheranism, rather than against Catholicism." The final step in introducing Calvinism was the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism, followed by a liturgy, a Church Order, and a Book of Discipline.

The Authors of the Heidelberg Catechism

Frederick chose two young men to write the Catechism: Zacharius Ursinus, a pupil of Melanchthon, 28 years old, and Caspar Olevianus, a pupil of Calvin, 26 years old. Ursinus (Latin for "Baer") was born at Breslau, in 1534, studied under Melanchthon at Wittenberg, travelled in Switzerland and France and in 1558 became professor at Breslau. But here his Reformed views aroused opposition and he had just decided to go "to the Zurichers" when in 1561 a call to Heidelberg came. After a life full of work, struggle and adversity he died in 1583, and lies buried in the church at Neustadt an der Hardt. The Reformed Church in the United States has erected a tablet to his memory near his resting place.—*Olevianus* ("von der Olewig") was born in Treves in 1536, studied law at Bourges, France; turned to theology, influenced by a miraculous rescue from drowning, and then studied under Calvin, Peter Martyr in Zurich, and Beza in Louvaine; preached in Treves, and when the Protestants were expelled he accepted a call to Heidelberg. He ended his life at Herborn in 1587, where he is buried. A tablet erected by the Reformed Church in the U. S. marks his resting place.

The Exact Method of Writing the Catechism

It is difficult to say with absolute accuracy what in the catechism belongs to the one author, and what to the other, for the book is so absolutely harmonious and synthetical throughout. This, however, seems to have been the method. A commission was appointed, consisting as Frederick says, of "the whole theological Faculty, all the superintendents and principal ministers." This commission assigned the task of preparing the book in Latin to Ursinus (as appears from a comparison with Ursinus' "Catechesis Minor"). Then it was revised and translated into German by Olevianus, so that to this great orator are due the classical diction, the happy phrasing and the musical cadences of the book. But the Elector himself also took an active part, as he testified before the Augsburg Diet in 1566: "I can prove by my own handwriting that after receiving the catechism from my theologians, I corrected it in several places." When completed, the catechism was examined and revised by a Synod held in January, 1563, at Heidelberg for eight days, closing on January 17th, with the Lord's Supper according to the Reformed manner. With the exception of the Superintendent of Ingelheim, the whole Synod signed the book.

On Monday, January 18, the Synod had an audience in the famous Heidelberger Schloss, when the Elector expressed his gratitude for their work, and on January 19, 1563, the Elector wrote the vigorous preface himself.

Sources and Plan of the Heidelberg Catechism

The Heidelberg Catechism is not the result of a sudden inspiration, but a careful compilation in the good sense of the word. Its authors had a rich catechetical literature before them, both Lutheran and Reformed. Dr. J. I. Good in his recent works has in a skillful manner traced much of the material of Questions 1, 21, 32, 54, 60, and others, back to the Catechisms of Leo Juda," of Bullinger, of Calvin, of Lasco, and others. Ursinus himself had written two works in Latin, "Summa Theologiae," and "Catechesis Minor," and Olevianus is believed to have published a writing on the "Covenant of Grace" though no trace of it can be found.

The *outline* of the Heidelberg Catechism is based on the three divisions of Romans, Man's Misery, Man's Deliverance, Man's Thankfulness. The use of Paul's plan was very likely suggested to the authors by Melanchthon's "Loci Communes" and Luther's "Short Form" of 1520. Ursinus' "Smaller Catechism" is also based on it. Thus Max Goebel is hardly saying too much when he writes, "The Heidelberg Catechism may in the true sense of the term be considered the flower and fruit of the whole German and French Reformation. It has Lutheran inwardness, Melanchthon clearness, Zwinglian simplicity, and Calvinistic fire, harmoniously blended."

The external form of the Heidelberg Catechism has been somewhat changed in later editions. When first published in 1563 the questions were not numbered, nor divided into Sunday lessons; the proof texts were placed on the margin, instead of below the text, and cited only by chapter. The first edition does not contain Question 80 on the mass; in the second edition we find the first part of Question 80, a clear objective definition of what the mass is, introduced by the Elector, because "admonished by me," as Olevianus writes to Calvin on April 3, 1563; the third edition added the vigorous denunciation of the mass as "an accursed idolatry," very likely in answer to the anathemas hurled against Protestantism by the Council of Trent just then in session. (See Prof. Hinke in Ref. Church Review, April, 1913, P. 165)

The Type of Doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism

As over against Romanism the Heidelberg Catechism is Protestant to the core, as is seen by an examination of the questions on justification by faith, good works, faith, purgatory, the invocation of the saints, the use of images, the mass, etc. (61-64, 91, 57, 30, 94, 96, 80.) As over against Socinian unitarianism and the Anabaptists it is thoroughly evangelical, teaching Christ's essential deity, the trinity, infant baptism, respect for civil government, (33, 75, 101, 104). As over against Lutheranism, it is genuinely Calvinistic, as is evident from its teaching on the Sacraments, on church discipline, its denial of the ubiquity of the glorified body of Christ,

its distinction between the visible and the invisible church (54, 83, to 85). "Its Calvinism, however, has none of those angularities, and excesses which now and then have detracted from the dignity of a noble system of thought. Little is said about the decrees, and nothing about any decree of reprobation" (Smellie). Predestination underlies Questions 1, 31, 54, etc. It contained enough of it to comfort the believing soul, but not enough to excite the controversial spirit. The question has often been raised in the Reformed Church whether the Heidelberg Catechism in its type of teaching was Melanchthonian or Calvinistic. To me it seems that while the Heidelberg Catechism is genuinely Calvinistic, its Calvinism is tempered by the Melanchthonian-Lutheran soil from which it sprang, both as to place and authors, and by the influence of the German spirit. It would be an anomaly of history if Calvinism in Germany were of the self-same type as that of Scotland, Holland and New England. In many respects, the Heidelberg Catechism is truly a "Union Catechism."

The Heidelberg Catechism and Lutheranism

As our Evangelical Synod holds with firmness and conviction to the principle of evangelical union concerning the distinguishing doctrines of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, the attitude of the Heidelberg Catechism to Lutheranism may therefore be of special interest in view of the fact that our synod comprises advocates of either views. As the time of its origin was a period of hot controversy, it was only natural that the Heidelberg Catechism should clearly differentiate the doctrinal position of the Reformed type from that of the Lutherans, especially on the sacraments, on Christ and on the Church. It does this, however, in a moderate tone and without polemical zeal.

A sharp distinction is drawn in the Heidelberg Catechism between the external signs of the sacraments and the spiritual realities which they symbolize. These realities are not bound up with nor communicated through the material elements. They are merely symbolized and sealed by the visible elements—water bread and wine (Ques. 69 and 75). Luther's Small Catechism says: "Baptism worketh forgiveness of sin, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to all who believe this." But the Heidelberg Catechism makes a sharp distinction between the symbolizing function of water and the regenerating activity of the Holy Spirit (Question 60-74). We are washed with Christ's blood and spirit not because we are baptized, but we are baptized because we have been already washed by Christ's spirit. In the Lord's Supper, the body and blood of Christ are not in, with and under the bread and wine to be received by worthy and unworthy alike, as the Lutherans believe, but the eating is spiritual, by faith, and the union in the

sacrament is mystical, not by a corporeal real presence. Thus the sacraments, according to the Heidelberg Catechism are confirmatory and symbolic of direct acts of God done independently of the sacraments (Condensed from "The Heidelberg Catechism, by Pres. G. W. Richards).

The Pervading Spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism

Well-earned praise has been bestowed on the wise moderation and the temper of sweet reasonableness of the Heidelberg Catechism. The book is never offensively polemical and displays no rancor or intolerance. Only with regard to Question 80 it has become the fashion to lament the denunciation of the mass as "an accursed idolatry" as too harsh and uncharitable. But when one remembers that the mass is the very citadel and root of the Romish corruption and perversion in all its features, then and now, the characterization of it in words taken from Paul (Gal. 1: 8-9) may be pardoned at a time when the Council of Trent was just in session condemning the Reformation. Dr. Lang says: "The sharp tone of its polemics against Rome enhances, in my estimation, the value of the Catechism."

The Stormy Reception of the Heidelberg Catechism

A terrific storm broke loose when the Heidelberg Catechism appeared in print. Lutheran princes and theologians opposed it vehemently. At the Augsburg Diet of 1566 the Elector was threatened with the loss of his territory, because only the adherents of the Lutheran Augsburg Confession enjoyed religious liberty. The mystic number 666 in Revelation was applied to it, because it contained as many errors. But on May 14, 1566 the Elector made such an impressive defense of the Heidelberg Catechism offering to lay down his life for the truth as seen by him, that the Emperor in his broken German said to him: "Nit kop ab; nit kop ab, lieber Fuerst," and several of his opponents shook hands with him, saying: "Fritz, du bist froemmer als wir."

The Spread of the Heidelberg Catechism

But in spite of all opposition the Heidelberg Catechism made its way, owing to its intrinsic worth. It has been translated into more than twenty European and Asiatic tongues. After the Bible, the Imitation of Christ by Thomas a Kempis, and Pilgrim's Progress no book can rival the Heidelberg Catechism in the number of its versions. Thus while its original purpose was to provide a creed and a textbook for a provincial church only, it very soon became a bond between all the Reformed and several of the Presbyterian and union churches throughout the world—an ecumenical creed. It was gradually adopted by the other Reformed Churches in Germany, by several Swiss Cantons (St. Gall, Schaffhausen, Berne); by the Synod of Dort (1618) by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian

Church in the United States, by Holland, Hungary, by Prussia, etc. The Heidelberg Catechism was first brought to America in 1609 by the Dutch, before Presbyterians, Lutherans and Puritans had arrived. By its intrinsic value it gradually displaced all but one (the Westminster Shorter Catechism) of the Reformed Catechisms, and is today one of the three catechisms of the Reformation period, which, as the fittest, have survived the dozens formerly in use. (Luther's Smaller Catechism, Westminster Shorter). A volume might easily be filled with golden opinions and praises of the Heidelberg Catechism. One may suffice. Bishop Hall, one of the British delegates to the Synod of Dort in 1619, said of the Heidelberg Catechism, after he had returned home: "Our Reformed brethren on the continent have a little book whose single leaves are not to be bought with tons of gold." As stated before, the Heidelberg Catechism is one of the three official confessions of our Evangelical Synod.

Comparison with the Westminster Shorter Catechism

Next in importance to the Heidelberg Catechism and Luther's Small Catechism is the Westminster Shorter Catechism of the Presbyterian Churches and it may therefore be of interest to compare these two books. Both agree on the fundamentals of the Calvinistic system. As to form the Westminster has the merit of greater brevity as to questions and answers. The questions of the Westminster Catechism are impersonal in the third person singular or first person plural), while in the Heidelberg Catechism about 37 questions and answers are in the first or second person singular, making them more personal. The catechumen is addressed as a baptized church member who answers the question from his present or prospective religious experience. A merit of the Westminster Catechism over the Heidelberg Catechism is that the question is embodied in the answer, thus making a full definition. As to their underlying principle, the Westminster Catechism is based on the Covenants (see Ques. 12 and 20), while the Heidelberg Catechism is built up on the creed (36 questions). As to spirit, the Westminster Catechism is more theological, a model of clear precise, logical definition, but more addressed to the head, while the Heidelberg Catechism is more experimental, more addressed to the feelings. (See first questions in both catechisms) Dr. Smellie's praise is almost too fulsome and the more to be valued because from the Presbyterian side. He writes in his "Books for the Heart" as follows: "Calvin's Catechism and that of the Westminster divines lack the element of poetry altogether, however excellent they are in other respects. Their authors have chosen the objective method, stating the truth in the form of dogma, looking at it for the time as some-

thing outside themselves, examining it dispassionately with reason and intellect, setting it forth in language as crystal-clear and definite as that in which men of science embody the results of their investigations. The writers of the Palatinate on the other hand, choose the subjective method, telling to others with gladness what has touched and transfigured their own souls, refusing to be impersonal in the statement of their cherished beliefs, making their words a joyous confession of the faith which is in themselves. The books of Geneva and Westminster are like statues—accurate, well-proportioned, impressive, but immobile and somewhat cold. The book of Heidelberg is like a living man. Some of the features of the man may not be so unerringly cut as those of the statue; but he has within him that of which it is destitute—a beating pulse and a quivering heart."

Has the Heidelberg Catechism Outlived Its Usefulness?

Not as a statement of the Reformed faith to be received by the office holders of the church, "for substance of doctrine." But as text-book for the young it was never entirely satisfactory, for as early as 1588 a Shorter Heidelberg Catechism was published in the very land of its birth. Since then the hundreds of simplified editions testify to the great love for the book as well as to its inadequacy as a textbook. No textbook on any subject written 350 years ago can fully meet the wants of the present day. What is wanted in the Reformed and other Churches is a briefer textbook, based on the entire Bible, couched as far as possible, in the language of the Bible, with brief questions and direct short and pithy answers: teaching Bible truth and attacking error from the modern viewpoint.

The Pressing Need of All Churches in America

is a genuine revival of catechisation by the pastor, conducted during at least six months of every year and once or twice in every week. This is the Biblical, most reasonable, and most effective method for holding the rising generation in the church and for preempting their young pliable minds and hearts before error has prejudiced them against the Bible. If this revival will not soon set in with power, the church will lose millions of the rising generation: for while the pastor may neglect so plain a duty, the opponents of the church use the press in all its forms, also in the form of catechisms and every other opportunity for sowing tares.

A Brief Bibliography

Inexpensive editions of the Heidelberg Catechism may be ordered from our Eden Publishing House; Geo. W. Richard, the Heidelberg Catechism; A. Smellie, Books for the Heart; Church Review, April, 1913; A. Lang, Der Heidelberger Katechismus.

THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE: IMPRESSIONS OF A METHODIST LAYMAN

Frank A. Horne, Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Christian Church at Lausanne brought its idealism and realism face to face, and the task of the Conference was to visualize and harmonize these contrasts. The ideals of unity, simplicity and spirituality, which characterized Christ and his early followers and which are clearly the will of God, met and challenged the painful reality of a divided, complex and ineffective church of today. We Methodists in contrition must confess the sin of disunion in our own family of Wesley, as well as in the larger fellowship of Christ. The impress of our essential spirit is thereby diluted and restricted, and the composite contribution which others, in the separation, might make likewise is denied to us and to the whole body of Christ in the present divided household of faith.

The first intimate knowledge of the writer concerning Lausanne was in connection with the work of the American Committee. At that time, under the inspiring leadership of Bishop Brent, a group of American laymen undertook the special financing necessary. Among these men were Charles E. Hughes, George W. Wickersham, James H. Post, William C. Breed, William Cooper Proctor, George Zabriski, Clifford W. Barnes, and other prominent laymen of all communions. To these practical men Christian unity and its effect on the church of tomorrow loomed large. Theological differences and ecclesiastical difficulties seem insignificant to the laymen in their enthusiasm for real unity.

When Lausanne was reached a different situation confronted us. As a layman I was instructed, interested and impressed by the proceedings, but found myself continually inquiring why theological technicalities and ancient traditions occupied such a prominent place, in the face of the great objective of a united Christendom and the need of the world of today and tomorrow.

Was the Conference a Success?

The question very properly has been raised: "Was the Conference a success?" While it is too soon for a final and correct appraisal of the results, it is not too early to discuss immediate reactions regarding the Conference, and to give first impressions. The great leaders of the Conference with singular unanimity affirm that it was a success.

Bishop Brent says, "The great thing is that it has happened. Never before in history has such a wide-spread attempt in the direction of God's will for unity been made. New friendships have been formed, horizons have been broadened, a great vision has been opened up to us."

Doctor Cadman states, "Never before in the history of Christendom has so widespread an attempt been made to fulfill God's will for the unity of his children. It made no attempt to destroy creeds or ecclesiastical barriers. It did not dream of coercing the conscience either of individuals or of groups. It was content to state agreements and differences in a wise and amicable temper."

Bishop McConnell in the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate reports, "The success lay not in any declarations themselves, but in the spirit which presided over all the discussions. I have been attending bodies for forty years, and never have I seen an important group where such exalted themes were up for discussion which showed anything of the fineness of spirit which characterized the Lausanne meeting. I am sure that the temper of the Lausanne Conference was nothing short of a spiritual miracle. In the best of temper the representatives of the different points of view advanced conceptions which at least seemed utterly opposed to one another, and yet did so in such fashion that the very discussion of the opposed positions, contradictory to one another as they might seem, contained the promise that a solution might ultimately be found."

Some of the editors of the church press of our own and other denominations who were not present evidently believe the Conference was a failure. Doctor Norwood, pastor of Saint Bartholomew's, of New York, in a recent sermon called the Conference a "pathetic failure." He was not present, or he would not have misrepresented the spirit of the Conference as he did in his sermon. If it was expected that the Conference would, in three weeks, reach agreements, compose differences, set up an organization and propose new articles of faith and order, then it was a failure, but if it was to be a council of better understanding, a deterrent of further division and a real beginning of ultimate unity, it was an unqualified success. The work of the Continuation Committee and what the great communions will do with the urgent subject of Christian unity will have much to do with future accomplishment and realization. As Bishop Brent says, "Unity begins in an inner attitude of mind and soul which ultimately mounts into the formation of a new character or disposition. It is for the churches, in cities and hamlets alike, to heed the spirit of Lausanne and to study, with minds steeped in the love of God as made known in Jesus Christ, the reports presented for their consideration."

There are certain factors which should be given special consideration in forming personal or corporate judgments and in rating the values of the Conference. The composition of the Conference must be remembered. There were five hundred delegates present from ninety independent self-governing churches, representing twenty-six countries. All of the great communions were represented

by delegates except the Roman Catholic Church and the Baptist Churches of Great Britain, based upon an invitation that was all inclusive.

Visualize the racial and language barriers, the dissimilarity of historic and traditional backgrounds, the divergent theological groups with doctrines and practices rooted back in the centuries. All of these conditions must be in our thinking in forming our conclusions as to the success of the Conference. Furthermore, it is apparent that such a council could not have been constituted otherwise, in any real attempt to face the problem.

Before forming your judgment, have in mind the procedure of the Conference. From the beginning it did not propose to adopt practical measures, but to seek agreements and discuss differences in order if possible to overcome them. All findings required unanimous consent, and even one negative vote was sufficient to alter, amend or eliminate any statement. The widest latitude was given for the expression of differences as well as agreements. Reports were not adopted and recommended to the churches, but received and referred to the constituent bodies. There was a definite disinclination on the part of many groups to accept federation or any other substitute for unity itself.

Impressions of a Lay Delegate

The personnel of the Conference was impressive. A perusal of the Who's Who of the membership discloses the names of the great leaders of the churches, prominent ecclesiastics, divines, and many eminent theological professors. The delegates were for the most part men past middle life and confined largely to the clergy. The writer made a count from the final membership list and found there were twenty-three laymen as we regard them, and eight women delegates. Probably less than half a dozen representatives of the younger generation under, say, forty years of age were present. The women made an effective protest, securing representation on the Continuation Committee, and one young minister vigorously expressed the attitude of the younger generation in a forward looking declaration.

Probably the outstanding impression of the Conference was its spirit and atmosphere. This was experienced and commented upon constantly by visitors and delegates alike. Throughout the entire time and at the great public meetings the dominant and compelling idea of unity was preeminent, persistent and potential.

The devotional periods were well attended and a pervasive spiritual tone was characteristic throughout the entire Conference. The hymns were sung and the Lord's Prayer repeated in three lan-

guages, with a new sense of one Father and one family. The attitude of the delegates was most fraternal and harmonious and even the most profound differences were discussed in a spirit of courtesy and tolerance. Respect for each other's conscience and convictions was fundamental.

Another distinct impression was the wisdom and courage exhibited by the leaders in facing and dealing with the great divisive questions of the ages, touching the nature of the church, the creeds, the ministry, the sacraments and the relation of the existing churches to unity. No issue was dodged, evaded or ignored, but all was brought out in the light of frank and full discussion and consideration. The great agreement reached by the Conference made a profound impression on all and themselves fully justified the convocation. They are very significant when one considers the variety of religious opinion and ecclesiastical organizations of the men who framed them.

The preamble, which includes the Call to Unity prepared by Bishop Brent; "The Message of the Church—The Gospel," and many portions of other reports, received a unanimous vote. The following ringing declaration from the reports on "The Church's Message—The Gospel," was stirring and effective, and registers a modern note which is most significant. Our Bishop McConnell was vice-chairman of this section and his influence can be readily detected.

"The gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society, at present, into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord. Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspirations, the church in the eternal gospel meets the needs and fulfills the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past, so also in the present, the gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through his church, the living Christ still says to men, 'Come unto me. He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'"

The frankness and fulness of statements of differences and the fairness in presenting all sides of a question were most striking to all observers. The strength of the Evangelical position in all these statements stood out boldly and seemed to a layman as most convincing. Those of contrary and more traditional views were apparently surprised at the insistence of the Evangelicals for their position and were placed continually on the defensive, particularly with regard to ancient beliefs and exclusive rites.

The following brief excerpts from the reports will illustrate the very frank and fearless discussion of differences:

1. From the report on "The Church's Common Confession of Faith."

"It must be noted also that some of the churches represented in this Conference conjoin traditions with the Scriptures, some are explicit in subordinating Creeds to the Scriptures, some attach a primary importance to their particular Confessions, and some make no use of Creeds."

2. From the report on "The Nature of the Church."

"Some hold that the visible expression of the church was determined by Christ himself and is therefore unchangeable; others that the one church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms. Some hold that one or other of the existing churches is the only true church; others that the church as we have described it is to be found in some or all of the existing communions taken together."

3. From the report on "The Ministry of the Church."

"These differences concern the nature of the ministry (whether consisting of one or several orders), the nature of ordination, and of the grace conferred thereby, the function and authority of Bishops, and the nature of Apostolic succession. We believe that the first step toward the overcoming of these difficulties is the frank recognition that they exist, and the clear definition of their nature. It is essential that the acceptance of any special form of ordination as the regular and orderly method of introduction into the ministry of the church for the future should not be interpreted to imply the acceptance of any one particular theory of the origin, character or function of any office in the church, or to involve the acceptance of any adverse judgment on the validity of ordination in those branches of the church universal that believe themselves to have retained valid and apostolic orders under other forms of ordination; or as disowning or discrediting a past or present ministry of the Word and Sacrament which has been used and blessed by the Spirit of God."

4. From the report on "The Sacraments."

"There are among us divergent views, especially as to (1) the mode and manner of the presence of our Lord; (2) the conception of the commemoration and the sacrifice; (3) the relation of the elements to the Grace conveyed; and (4) the relation between the minister of this Sacrament and the validity and efficacy of the rite. We are aware that the reality of the divine presence and gift in this Sacrament cannot be adequately apprehended by human thought or expressed in human language."

"We close this statement with the prayer that the differences which prevent full communion at the present time may be removed."

Another outstanding result of the discussions which distinctly impressed me was the essential unity and agreement of the Evangelical and non-Catholic churches or divisions. Minor differences in organization and polity seemed to disappear in a new brotherhood of understanding.

I now come to a rather discouraging observation concerning the Conference, which was not unexpected, but nevertheless seems to stand in the way of any complete union of Christendom in the near future. It is the present apparently insuperable differences between the Anglo-Catholic churches and the Evangelical denominations. Likewise there is the inevitable cleavage between the established and free churches, which indicates a difficult situation. No one at Lausanne, except possibly a small group, seemed to take seriously the opinion of Bishop Manning, repeated in a recent sermon, that the Anglican churches in England and in the United States hold the key to the reunion of the Catholic churches and the Protestant denominations because of their position between the two divisions. The Roman church logically declined to participate in the Conference. The Greek Orthodox Church represented throughout the sessions consistently requested to be excused from voting on the controversial topics. The Anglo-Catholics, however, of the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church, had rather a hard time in maintaining their position and combating the preponderance of opposing views. The differences in the Church of England, and to some extent in the Protestant Episcopal Church, were quite apparent directly and indirectly. The real issue was not joined in the plenary sessions until the report was presented from Section 7 on the Relation of Existing Churches to the United Church. Here at last the Conference was facing the future and the report deals with the matter seemingly in a most reasonable and constructive fashion. Although representatives of the Anglican-Episcopal communion were well represented on the section dealing with the subject, it so happened they were largely of the liberal party. Without attempting to suggest amendments or offering a statement of the opposing views, which was in order, at the instance of Bishop Manning, of New York, a motion was made to recommit the whole report. After discussion, and some protest because of this unusual procedure, only nine votes were registered in favor of the motion. The rest of the house, perhaps of three hundred delegates, voted to the contrary. The ground of the opposition to the report sponsored by Bishop Manning, of New York, and Bishop Gore, of England, was that it would offend and make impossible approaches for unity to the Roman Catholic Church. The much discussed difference on the last day was a similar episode and really represented

the open opposition of two members of the high church party of the Protestant Episcopalians of the United States with respect to final action of this same report on the Relation of Existing Churches to the United Church. Their action was repudiated by the Evangelical branch of their own communion. This difficulty was overcome by the Conference voting to receive the report and referring it to the Continuation Committee for revision and restatement. These incidents revealed the very small minority who held to their views.

The Catholic movement is said to be spreading in the Church of England and the breach there reported as becoming very pronounced and serious. The writer has it on the authority of a well-informed clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church that the Catholic party in this country, with respect to the ministers, represents about thirty percent of their clergy, while in England the proportion of the Catholic party in the clergy is about sixty percent. The laity would not register as high a percentage, it is thought, in either country. The recent Anglo-Catholic Congress of the Protestant Episcopal Church, meeting at Albany, N. Y., indicates that the tendency of the Catholic party is toward Rome rather than to Protestantism. The growth of the Catholic movement and its development "through the stage of 'ritualism' to eucharistic devotions and extra-liturgical observances" was discussed at the Congress and the goal said to be "the reunion of the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ." Where the sympathy and ultimate destination of the Evangelical party of the Episcopal Church lies can be easily imagined. It would appear, therefore, that any unity between those who hold the Catholic position and the Evangelical communions is most impossible at the present time.

My own realization of the great remoteness of any possible merger between Protestantism and the Roman Catholic Church or with those going that way in doctrine and worship was greatly accentuated by my recent visit to Italy and Rome. It is also evident by the reported action of the Vatican in suppressing Father Sanson, the popular priest of Notre Dame, because of liberal tendencies, and the reported movement in the Roman Church to restore the temporal power of the Pope.

What Are the Next Steps?

It would seem that there are two ways of following up the work of Lausanne and keeping the ideals of Christian unity before the churches; first, by the Continuation Committee perpetuating and keeping alive the work of Lausanne and arranging another World Conference at the proper time with the expectation that a newer generation will advance the cause from the splendid begin-

ning now made; and second, to deal with the great subject from the bottom up by seriously attempting to bring together religious bodies of similar types. At Lausanne, in informal circles, there was considerable discussion of the possibility of a union with such bodies as the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Reformed churches, and possibly other denominations. The success of the United Church of Canada, which was brought prominently forward at Lausanne, was cited as an example of what might occur in the United States and elsewhere. It may be that the shortest route for unity between the two Methodisms of the United States would be by the way of this larger amalgamation.

Suppose this should happen in the United States, considering only the larger denominations in each group, it would mean that the United Church would have 11,000,000 members out of 27,500,000 Protestants, or about forty percent of the total. If a world-wide merger were undertaken, figured on the basis of adherents and dealing with the total of the respective groups, there would be a constituency of 68,000,000 adherents, one half of which (or 34,000,000) would be in North America. Consider what could be accomplished with such a united body, in the field of our competing city and rural work; in the consolidated equipment and trained staff possible in the several communities; in the influence and power with respect to public opinion and the attitude of the church on great social and international questions; and in the mission fields of the church. The significance and importance of such a movement would be challenging to the young generation, inspiring to Christianity at large, and set up processes that might ventuate in ultimate complete unity. Our own General Conference at Kansas City next May might well take suitable action by the appointment of a commission or otherwise to consider Christian unity and confer with like commissions of other communions.

Lausanne was a prophecy in part of the church that is to be in the declarations which repeatedly found utterance as to the essential conditions which must be realized. The preponderance of sentiment was that the unity sought must be rich in diversity and not hampered by uniformity. It must provide for freedom of understanding interpretation and expression of religious truth and grant great liberty in the manner and mode of worship. It must forever place spiritual values and militant Christianity in the world it serves above all form, ceremony and ecclesiastical impedimenta whatsoever. *Methodist Review.*

Die ältere liberale Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I.

Schleiermacher proklamierte die Unabhängigkeit der Theologie und Philosophie. In Wirklichkeit machte er seine Theologie von philosophischen Voraussetzungen abhängig, die er allerdings meist selbst geschaffen hatte. Sein großer persönlicher und sachlicher Gegner an der Berliner Universität, der Philosoph **Hegel** (1770—1831) wollte dagegen Vernunft und Religion und infolgedessen Theologie und Philosophie miteinander verbinden. Er erklärte einmal: „Der Zweck dieser Vorlesung war die Vernunft zu versöhnen mit der Religion." Er fügte seinem philosophischen System eine Behandlung der gesamten Religionsgeschichte und des Christentums ein, die besonders auf die Entstehung der älteren liberalen Theologie gewirkt hat. Nur im Hinblick auf diese theologische Auswirkung ist hier von **Hegels Ideen** zu reden. Im Gegensatz zu Schleiermacher ist Hegel Intellektualist. Im Denken erfassen wir die Wirklichkeit, wie sie objektiv ist. Infolgedessen erkennt der philosophische Denker alle Erscheinungen in ihrem tatsächlichen Sein, einschließlich der religiösen Tatbestände und zwar nicht nur in dieser Welt, sondern auch in der transzendenten. Auch Gott ist im menschlichen Denken erfaßbar. Philosophie und Theologie haben darum denselben Inhalt nämlich den absoluten Geist oder Gott, aber in verschiedener Form. Die Religion und die Theologie erfassen Gott nur in anschaulich-bildlich-mythischer Form, die noch zahlreiche Widersprüche für das Denken enthält: „Im Glauben ist wohl schon der wahrhaftige Inhalt, aber es fehlt ihm noch die Form des Denkens." Ihre Herstellung durch Ausbildung klarer entsprechender harmonischer und geistiger Begriffe vollzieht die Philosophie. „Der wahrhafte christliche Glaubensinhalt ist zu rechtfertigen durch die Philosophie nicht durch die Geschichte." — **Durch dieses Programm hat Hegel eine Umdeutung und eine Auflösung des kirchlichen Dogmas angebahnt und seine historischen Bestandteile und Glaubensgedanken durch allgemeine philosophische Ideen und rationale Begriffe ersetzt.** Gerade in dieser Methode ist ihm die ältere liberale Theologie gefolgt und hat sie konkret durchgeführt.

Für Hegel trägt Gott und die Welt nicht den Charakter ruhenden Seins, sondern denjenigen steter Entwicklung. Nicht nur die Welt, sondern auch Gott entwickelt sich, das heißt Gott entfaltet in einer zusammenhängenden zielstrebigen Bewegung, die in der Form von Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis, erfolgt, sein Wesen und sein Bewußtsein bis zur höchsten Vollendung. Die Entwicklung Gottes

in und mit der Welt geht zunächst durch die Natur und wandert dann durch die Reiche des Geistes. In dem letzteren wird eine Sphäre des subjektiven, des objektiven und des absoluten Geistes von einander unterschieden. Der absolute Geist bewegt sich in stetig steigender Offenbarung von der Kunst zur Religion und von dieser zur Philosophie aufwärts. Auch innerhalb der Religionsgeschichte besteht eine immer deutlicher steigende Entwicklung in welcher sich Gott stetig reiner offenbart und damit seiner selbst immer klarer bewußt wird. In seinen früheren Veröffentlichungen unterschied Hegel die natürliche Religion, die Kunstreligion und die offenbarte Religion; in seinen späteren Darlegungen differenzierte er die einzelnen Religionen noch schärfer und gab jeder geschichtlichen Religion als Aufgabe die Verwirklichung einer besondern Idee.

In diese einheitliche religionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung gehört nach Hegel auch das Christentum. Es ist nicht nur die höchste, sondern auch die vollendete, ja absolute und unüberbietbare Form der Religion. Denn im Christentum gelangt der Begriff der Religion: „Selbstbewußtsein Gottes im Menschengeist" zu voller Klarheit und Wirklichkeit. Im geschichtlichen Christus kommt als dem Gottmenschen die an und für sich bestehende Einheit zwischen Gottheit und Menschheit zu vollendetem Bewußtsein und zur geschichtlichen das heißt zur anschaulichen mythischen Darstellung. **So versucht Hegel sowohl den Zusammenhang wie die Eigenart des Christentums zu wahren und seine geschichtliche Erscheinung als Ausdruck einer philosophischen Idee zu werten.** Bei einer solchen stetig steigenden geradlinigen Entwicklung in der Welt, besonders in der Religionsgeschichte kann von einer wirklich gegensätzlichen Macht in sittlicher und rationeller Hinsicht nicht die Rede sein. Infolgedessen ist die **Sünde** bei Hegel nicht nur ein notwendiger Durchgangspunkt, sondern eine wertvolle Triebkraft in der sittlichen Höherentwicklung der Menschheit. „Der Sündenfall ist der ewige Mythus des Menschen, wodurch er eben Mensch ward." So wenig wie der Sündenfall ist im Grunde auch die Versöhnung eine einmalige geschichtliche Tatsache, die Neues schafft. Sie ist nur die plastische Darstellung der an sich bestehenden ewigen monistischen Einheit zwischen Gottheit und Menschheit. „Es muß dem Menschen die an sich seiende Einheit der göttlichen und menschlichen Natur in gegenständlicher Weise offenbart werden."

Das soziale Produkt der Christentumsgeschichte ist zunächst die **Kirche**; diese soll aber nur Mittel zu dem Zweck sein, die ganze menschliche Gesellschaft sittlich-religiös zu beeinflussen. Die höchste Form ist der Rechts- und Kulturstaat, in dem auch alle Sittlichkeit und Religion ihre höchste Sozialform findet, sodaß sich die Kirche in ihm idealer Weise auflösen soll. **Vor allem durch den Entwicklungsgedanken und seine Anwendung auf die Religionsgeschichte**

und das Christentum hat Hegel den Grund gelegt für die den theologischen Liberalismus charakterisierende Entwicklungsdogmatik. Nicht minder aber hat er die schon bei Schleiermacher beobachtete **Tendenz zum Pantheismus verstärkt.** Sagt er doch: „Unser Leben in Gott ist Gottes Leben in uns, nicht im bildlichen, sondern im genauesten Sinn des Wortes," und: „Ohne Welt ist Gott nicht Gott." Die dualistische Anschauung von der Sünde und dementsprechend auch von der Versöhnung als Aufhebung eines wirklichen Gegensatzes hat Hegel auf das stärkste unterminiert. Auf ethisch-sozialem Gebiet sucht er den **Unterschied zwischen Kirche und Staat zu beseitigen** und den letzteren als die höhere und idealere Sozialform erscheinen zu lassen. Unter großen geistesgeschichtlichen Gesichtspunkten beurteilt, kann man sagen: **Eine antik-optimistische wieder modern gemachte Weltanschauung gestaltet bei Hegel die urchristlich-altprotestantische mit ihren dualistisch-pessimistischen Gedankengängen radikal um.** Hegel suchte allerdings selbst den Gegensatz seiner Religionsphilosophie zum Altprotestantismus zu verschleiern. Aber er erklärte doch deutlich, daß jener nur der erste aber noch stark gehemmte Durchbruch des modernen Geistes gewesen sei und das protestantische Prinzip erst von der neuen, besonders seiner Philosophie in voller Reinheit durchgeführt wäre. „Im alten Protestantismus hat sich das subjektive religiöse Prinzip von der Philosophie getrennt und erst in ihr ist es auf wahrhaftige Weise auferstanden." Während die sogenannte Hegelsche Rechte die Gedanken des Meisters mit der überlieferten Tradition auszugleichen suchte, hat die geistes- und theologiegeschichtliche viel bedeutsamer gewordene Hegelsche Linke die tatsächlichen Differenzen zwischen dieser Philosophie und dem geschichtlichen Christentum ans Licht gefördert.

II.

Die Prinzipien Hegels sind in besondrer Klarheit auf die christliche Glaubenslehre von dem persönlich tieffrommen, aber in seiner Theologie durchaus liberalen Schweizer Theologen **A. E. Biedermann** (1819—1885) in der ersten Auflage seiner „Christlichen Dogmatik" (1868) angewandt. Er geht von den kirchlich-biblischen Dogmen aus, sucht aber jedesmal den mythischen Charakter ihrer geschichtlichen Grundlagen und die logischen Widersprüche ihrer Formulierungen, wie etwa bei der Zweinaturenlehre nachzuweisen. Dann aber ist es sein positives Ziel den diesen Dogmen zugrunde liegenden religiösen Inhalt auf haltbare philosophische Formeln zu bringen. „Wissenschaftlich wahr ist ein Glaubensausdruck in dem Grad, als er den Inhalt des christlichen Prinzips auf seinen reinen Gedankenausdruck bringt." Bei der **Gotteslehre** wird die Persönlichkeitsvorstellung abgelehnt und durch den Begriff des absoluten Geistes ersetzt; aus der individuellen **Unsterblichkeit** wird ein ewiges Fortleben im allgemeinen Geist: „Die Annahme eines Fort-

lebens des Menschen über seine individuelle Lebenszeit hinaus ist in Wahrheit religiös indifferent." Besondre Mühe hat Biedermann darauf verwandt zwischen der christlichen **Erlösungsidee,** der Verbindung des Unendlichen mit dem Endlichen, und der geschichtlichen Person Jesu noch einen Zusammenhang zu stiften. In Jesu Persönlichkeit soll dieses Prinzip zum ersten Mal in der Geschichte zur Selbsterkenntnis und damit zur Verwirklichung gekommen sein. Infolgedessen sei Jesus überhaupt „das welthistorisch gewährleistende Vorbild für die Wirksamkeit des Erlösungsprinzipes." Aber wie Biedermann überall die biblisch-kirchlichen Dogmen nicht nur durch andre begriffliche Formulierungen ersetzt, sondern ihres eigenartigen religiösen wie geschichtlichen Inhalts beraubt, so ist auch seine Verbindung zwischen der idealen Erlösungsidee und der geschichtlichen Person Jesu schon eine so lose, daß konsequentes Denken ihre völlige Trennung vornehmen mußte.

III.

Die zerstörende Kraft der Hegelschen Philosophie gegenüber dem geschichtlichen, religiösen, wie metaphysischen Gehalt des Christentums tritt bei **D. Fr. Strauß** (1808—1874) hervor. Seine Bedeutung für die Theologiegeschichte — allerdings wesentlich für die Negationen des Liberalismus innerhalb und außerhalb der Kirche — kann nicht hochgenug eingeschätzt werden. Im Jahre 1835 erschien sein erstes **„Leben Jesu,"** welches ungeheures Aufsehen erregte. Die entscheidende und dauernde Bedeutung des Buches liegt nicht nur in der historisch-kritischen Zersetzung der gesamten überlieferten biblischen Geschichte Jesu, sondern in dem diese leitenden Prinzipien, die ihren Ursprung in der Hegelschen Philosophie haben. Strauß bekennt nämlich in der Einleitung: „Die innere Befreiung des Gemütes und Denkens von gewissen religiösen und dogmatischen Voraussetzungen ist dem Verfasser durch philosophische Studien früh zuteil geworden. Mögen die Theologen diese Voraussetzungslosigkeit seines Werkes unchristlich finden, er findet die gläubigen Voraussetzungen der übrigen unwissenschaftlich." Strauß macht zwar hier einerseits das dialektische Kunststück, daß er theologischen Voraussetzungen seine angebliche Voraussetzungslosigkeit gegenüberstellt, anderseits aber gesteht er doch offen ein, daß ihn selbst philosophische Voraussetzungen, wenn auch negativer Art entscheidend beeinflussen. Als solche Voraussetzungen nennt Strauß die Ablehnung jedes Supranaturalismus, und die Ueberzeugung, daß auch die biblische Ueberlieferung nur „ein festes Gewebe endlicher Ursachen und Wirkungen" sein könne. **Es handelt sich mithin schon bei Strauß,** wie bei der ihm folgenden liberalen Theologie **nicht um den Gegensatz von Historie und Dogmatik,** wie man es manchmal gern erscheinen lassen wollte, **sondern um den Zusammenstoß von zwei Dogmatiken oder Philosophien, einer christlichen und einer philosophischen.**

Nach Strauß Dogmatik müssen die biblischen Erzählungen den Charakter von Sagen oder **Mythen** tragen. Er definiert Mythen als geschichtsartige Einkleidungen urchristlicher Ideen. Sie sind nach der früheren Aussage von Strauß absichtslos, in der ersten Gemeinde unter dem stärkeren Eindruck der Persönlichkeit Jesu entstanden, nach seiner späteren Behauptung dagegen sind sie absichtsvolle und tendenziöse Bildungen einzelner Männer. Stoff und Form dieser Mythenbildungen läßt Strauß meistens aus dem **Alten Testament,** weniger aus heidnischen Religionen erwachsen. So soll zum Beispiel aus Jes. 7, 14 die Jungfrauengeburt, aus 4. Mose 24, 17, das heißt aus dem Stern Bileams, der Stern von Bethlehem entstanden sein. Die wunderbare Speisung der Witwe von Zarepta soll das Motiv für die wunderbaren Speisungen Jesu abgegeben haben. Selbst einen so menschlichen Vorgang wie der Gebetskampf Jesu in der Gethsemane hält Strauß für erdichtet, da Jesus damals noch nichts von seinem Leiden gewußt haben könnte. Nachdem Strauß durch diese Methode fast alle geschichtlichen Erzählungen des Neuen Testaments, besonders alle Wunder und die Heilstatsachen in Mythen aufgelöst hat, will auch er doch noch zuletzt die ihnen zugrunde liegenden **religionsphilosophischen Ideen** herausarbeiten und an diesen positiv festhalten. Allerdings sieht er die christliche Idee nicht mehr ausschließlich, ja im Grund überhaupt nicht in der geschichtlichen Person Jesu verwirklicht, sondern in der ganzen Menschheit. **Er löst bewußt** — im Unterschied zu Hegel und Biedermann — **die Beziehungen zwischen dem christlichen Prinzip und der Person Jesu.** Er proklamiert geradezu als philosophisches Dogma die antipersonalistische These: „Die Idee liebt es nicht in ein Exemplar ihre ganze Fülle auszuschütten." Daraus ergibt sich ihm als Schluß: „Das ist der Schlüssel der ganzen Christologie, daß als Subjekt der Prädikate, welche die Kirche Christo beilegt, statt eines Individuums eine Idee gesetzt werden muß. In einem Individuum, einem Gottmenschen gedacht, widersprechen sich die Eigenschaften und Funktionen, welche die Kirchenlehre Christo zuschreibt, in der Idee der Gattung stimmen sie zusammen. Die Menschheit ist die Vereinigung der beiden Naturen, der menschgewordene Gott. Sie ist der Sterbende, Auferstehende und gen Himmelfahrende, sofern aus der Negation ihrer Natürlichkeit immer höheres geistiges Leben, aus der Aufhebung ihrer Endlichkeit als persönlichen, nationalen, und weltlichen Geistes ihre Einigkeit mit dem unendlichen Geist des Himmels hervorgeht."

In zwei weiteren Schriften vollzog Strauß die dogmatische und geschichtliche Auflösung des Christentums noch bedeutend radikaler. In dem Buch **„Die christliche Glaubenslehre** in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampf mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt" (1840) wollte er der Dogmatik das leisten, „was

einem Handelshaus die Bilanz leistet." Diese Bilanz aber ergibt bei ihm eine völlige Unmöglichkeit, das Christentum noch in der modernen Welt zu vertreten. Dieses negative Ergebnis soll die dogmengeschichtliche Entwicklung mit all ihren Widersprüchen unwiderleglich zeigen: „Die wahre Kritik des Dogmas ist seine Geschichte."

In dem Buch **„Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet"** (1864) behauptet Strauß, daß man von wenigen Menschen so wenig wisse, wie von dem geschichtlichen Jesus, und das selbst dieses Wenige besonders in ethischer Richtung nicht immer vorbildlich und für uns noch gültig sei. Infolgedessen kann sich der Glaube nicht mehr auf ihn richten, sondern vielmehr auf einen idealen, stetig in der menschlichen Vernunft vorhandenen „Christus," der wesentlich das allgemeine humanistische Menschheitsideal repräsentiert. „Diese Unterscheidung des historischen Christus von dem idealen, das heißt dem in der menschlichen Vernunft liegenden Urbild des Menschen, wie er sein soll, und die Uebertragung des seligmachenden Glaubens von dem ersteren auf das letztere ist das unabweisliche Ergebnis der neueren Geistesentwicklung: **es ist die Fortbildung der Christusreligion zur Humanitätsreligion.**" In diesem zweiten Leben Jesu erscheinen die biblischen Ueberlieferungen nicht mehr als unbewußt geschaffene Mythen, sondern als absichtsvolle Dichtungen.

Aber auch bei dieser idealistischen Umdeutung des Christentums bleibt Strauß nicht stehen. In seiner letzten Schrift: **„Der alte und der neue Glaube"** (1872) wirft er die Frage auf: „Sind wir noch Christen?" und beantwortet sie mit Nein, und läßt ihr die weitere folgen: „Haben wir noch Religion?" worauf er die Antwort gibt — Ja und Nein. Er lehnt das Christentum und die Religion darum und soweit ab, wie sie ihm als eine pessimistische und asketische Gedankenwelt erscheint.

Meint er doch auch von der **Reformation,** sie habe noch nicht alle Entfremdung des Geistes aufgehoben: „Die Erde blieb nach wie vor ein Jammertal, aus welchem sich in ein besseres Jenseits hinwegzusehnen, dem wahren Christen nicht unerlaubt, sondern wohlanständig war." — Strauß selbst vertritt in seiner letzten Schrift einen naturwissenschaftlich, darwinistisch begründeten ästhetisch-künstlerisch ausgestalteten Materialismus. Zusammenfassend gilt: **Strauß hat die entscheidenden philosophischen Voraussetzungen einer antisupranaturalistischen und humanistischen Entwicklungsdogmatik geschaffen. Nicht minder hat er die kritischen Methoden und zum großen Teil auch die Ergebnisse des religionsgeschichtlichen Liberalismus geschaffen. Darüber hinausgehend schmiedete er auch die Waffen für einen das Christentum ablehnenden humanistischen**

Idealismus, dann aber auch für einen, jede Religion verwerfenden naturwissenschaftlichen Materialismus. Ihm selbst ist freilich zuletzt das nicht unverdiente tragische Schicksal zuteil geworden, daß ein noch entschiedener Gegner des Christentums, Nietzsche, in einer besondern „Unzeitgemäßen Betrachtung" Strauß als „Bildungsphilister," der eine Religion der Zukunft schaffen wollte, verspottete.

IV.

Die letzte noch mögliche negative Konsequenz in historischer Richtung zog **Bruno Bauer** (1809—1882). Er **löste die Historizität Jesu restlos auf** und erklärte das Christentum für das Geistesprodukt der griechisch-römischen Welt des ausgehenden zweiten Jahrhunderts. „Der christliche Heiland und die Träger des römischen Imperatorentums sind Erzeugnisse derselben Kraft, welche die Ahnungen und immateriellen Güter des Altertums in eine persönliche allmächtige Gestalt zusammenzufassen suchte." – Dieses aus einer antipersonalistischen Welt- und Geschichtsauffassung erwachsene Dogma ist von Zeit zu Zeit immer wieder mit neuen scheinbar geschichtlichen Argumenten belebt, so im 20. Jahrhundert von Arthur Drews in seiner „Christusmythe."

Die letzte negative Konsequenz in metaphysisch-religiöser Richtung zog **L. Feuerbach** (1804—1872) in seinen beiden Werken: „Das Wesen des Christentums" (1841) und „Das Wesen der Religion" (1845). Auch er beginnt bei Hegel, wendet sich aber allmählich vom Idealismus ab und dem Materialismus zu, wie Strauß. Feuerbach bezeichnet es als seine Grundabsicht: „Die Menschen aus Theologen zu Anthropologen, aus Theophilen zu Philanthropen, aus Kandidaten des Jenseits zu Studenten des Diesseits zu machen." Er suchte und fand das Geheimnis der Theologie in der Anthropologie. Die Götter sind nur ins Transzendente erhobene praktische, — unerfüllbare oder erfüllte — menschliche Herzenswünsche. „Der Wunsch ist der Ursprung, ist das Wesen selbst der Religion, das Wesen der Götter nichts anders als das Wesen des Wunsches. Wie die Wünsche der Menschen so sind ihre Götter." — „Die Religion, wenigstens die christliche ist das Verhalten der Menschen zu sich selbst oder richtiger zu seinem Wesen als einem andern Wesen." Ebenso steht es mit dem Jenseits: „So ist das Jenseits nichts anders als das Diesseits, befreit von dem was als Schranke, was als Uebel erscheint." **Sind Gotteserkenntnis wie Jenseitsglaube nur menschliche Wunschgebilde, so ist Religion und Christentum — „Illusion."** Nach Feuerbach handelt es sich aber nicht einmal um eine wohltätige Illusion, sondern um eine grundverderbliche, weil die Religion den Menschen „um die Kraft des wirklichen Lebens und um den Wahrheits- und Tugendsinn bringt." Nach dieser Methode erklärt und kritisiert Feuerbach alle einzelnen Vorstellungen des Chri-

stentums. Sein Radikalismus geht weit über alle liberale innertheologische Kritik hinaus und wird zu dem charakteristischen Grundgedanken eines in antireligiösen Kreisen weitverbreiteten Dogmas, welches **in der Religion eine theoretische Illusion und eine praktische Schädigung der innerweltlichen sittlichen Aktivität sieht.**

V.

Innerhalb der Theologie und zwar der altliberalen hielt sich die außerordentliche umfangreiche Lebensarbeit des großen Kritikers **F. Chr. Baur** in Tübingen (1792—1862), dem sich eine weitverbreitete Schule anschloß. Sein eigentliches Arbeitsgebiet war zwar das Neue Testament und die Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, aus deren sich aber bedeutende Konsequenzen für die gesamte Theologie ergaben. Auch Baur erklärte: „Ohne Philosophie ist mir die Geschichte stumm," und leugnete prinzipiell jedes Wunder, weil es den natürlichen Zusammenhang der Geschichte aufhebt. Trotzdem wollte er nach rein exakt-historischer Methode neutestamentliche Quellenkritik treiben. Ihr Ergebnis war nur die Echtheit von vier Paulinen (Römer, Galater, 1. und 2. Korinther Brief) und dann der judäistischen Apokalypse. Auf Grund der Quellen, aber nach Hegelschen Prinzipien zeichnete er die Geschichte des apostolischen Zeitalters als eines bewußten Kampfes zwischen einem streng partikularistischen Judaismus und einem heiden-christlichen Universalismus. Die „Tendenzen" des ersteren vertritt das Buch des Matthäus, des letzteren Lukas, während Markus beide neutralisiert. Aus dieser Synthese erwuchs die Katholische Kirche; auch die ganze weitere Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte konstruierte Baur entwicklungsgeschichtlich nach Hegelschen Prinzipien. Auf den Katholizismus folgt als Gegenschlag wie als höhere Stufe der Altprotestantismus, der aber seinerseits wieder durch den seit dem 18. Jahrhundert sich bildenden Neuprotestantismus abgelöst wird. Dieser erst kritisiert mit Recht das von der Reformation noch stehen gelassene altkirchliche Dogma. Positiv ist der Neuprotestantismus: „Humanisierung, Rationalisierung, Subjektivierung, Verinnerlichung, Vergeistigung des Christentums." In dieser Richtung soll die gegenwärtige Theologie die christlichen Dogmen umgestalten, wie das Baur selbst in einer eingehenden Monographie gegenüber dem Dreieinigkeitsglauben unternommen hat. Mit dieser Arbeit wird allerdings die Theologie niemals fertig werden und soll es auch nicht, denn der Protestantismus ist „ein einer unendlichen Entwicklung fähiges Prinzip." **So hat Baur nicht nur das Hegelsche Prinzip konsequent auf die gesamte Geschichte des Christentums angewandt, sondern auch die Prinzipien und Ziele der altliberalen Theologie klar zum Ausdruck gebracht.**

VI.

Der Heidelberger Theologe **R. Rothe** (1799—1867) steht sowohl unter den Einflüssen Schleiermachers wie Hegels, hat aber aus den verschiedenen Anregungen eines der originalsten und geistvollsten Systeme der neueren Theologiegeschichte geschaffen. In ihm finden sich gewiß starke Beziehungen zum Altprotestantismus, in seiner Lehre von Wunder, Offenbarung, Inspiration vor allem aber grundlegende Thesen des älteren und neueren Liberalismus. Nur die letzteren haben eine größere theologiegeschichtliche Wirkung gehabt, vor allem durch Troeltsch, und sind darum allein an dieser Stelle zu reproduzieren. In seiner „Theologische Ethik" (1. Auflage 1845 ff.) entwarf Rothe ein ganzes **philosophisch-theologisches System mit besondrer Abzweckung auf die Sittlichkeit.** Er nahm einmal eine Entwicklung schon in Gott und von Gott abwärts zur Welt und dann wieder von der Welt zu Gott aufwärts an. Er kombinierte theistische, pantheistische, neuplatonische, ja gnostische Elemente miteinander. Nachdem er das Wesen Gottes spekulativ entwickelt hat, schildert er die von Gott geschaffene Natur. Innerhalb dieser beginnt mit der menschlichen Persönlichkeit und ihrer Freiheit eine ganz neue Stufe. Der Mensch hat die sittliche Aufgabe, sich die materielle Natur anzueignen, und dadurch einen vergeistigten Naturorganismus zu schaffen. Erst mit seinem Besitz wird der Mensch zum Ebenbild Gottes, sodaß der sittliche Prozeß auch zugleich ein religiöser ist. Der Vergeistigungsprozeß der Natur verläuft allerdings abnormal, da die sinnliche Natur das Uebergewicht über den Geist hat. Dieser Tatbestand macht das Wesen der Sünde aus. Infolgedessen vollzieht Gott in Christus eine Erlösung. Sie besteht darin, daß Gott in Christus einen „zweiten Adam" in die Geschichte eintreten läßt. „Der zweite Adam tritt auf übernatürliche Weise ins Leben, aber aus der natürlichen Menschheit hervor. Er wird der neuen, durch ihn aus der Materie in den Geist umgeborenen, Menschheit der prinzipielle Lebensmittelpunkt, das Haupt, das Zentralindividuum einer neuen geistigen Menschheit." **Zunächst in Christus und dann durch ihn in der Welt erfolgt die schöpferische Umbildung der Natur durch den Geist.**

Für Rothe ist Zweck und Ziel der göttlichen Schöpfung wie der christlichen Neuschöpfung die Ineinsbildung von Natur und Geist oder die **Herstellung von sittlicher Kultur.** In ihr hat auch die Religion ihren höchsten Zweck. Die spezielle Bedeutung des Christentums besteht darin, daß es die Hemmungen der Sünde überwindet und die Erreichung des kulturellen Endzieles ermöglicht. Dementsprechend ist auch die **Kirche** das heißt die soziale Schöpfung des Christentums nur eine vorläufige Erscheinung und ein Mittel zu dem Zweck, eine allgemein menschliche soziale Kultur-

gemeinschaft hervorzurufen. Diese ist der Staat. „An der Gemeinschaft der Erlösung tritt ursprünglich bestimmt die religiöse Seite hervor. Das Reich Gottes bildet sich also geschichtlich primitiv als die christliche Kirche. Wiewohl die christliche Gemeinschaft nicht als Staat anheben kann, sondern nur als Kirche, so ist doch das notwendige Resultat ihrer eigenen Lebensentwicklung die allmähliche Aufhebung ihrer kirchlichen Form durch die Umbildung derselben in die staatliche." **Das Christentum soll sich darum immer vollständiger verweltlichen, das heißt seine kirchliche Formablegen, um in die des Staates überzugehen,** der die Totalität der sittlichen Zwecke umfaßt. — In dieser Richtung bedeutet die Reformation einen Fortschritt. Aber nach Rothe ist gerade das altprotestantische Luthertum durch seinen exklusiven Supranaturalismus und sein Festhalten an dem Kirchenbegriff noch stark katholisch. Die kulturelle Humanisierung kommt viel deutlicher in der Renaissance zum Ausdruck, der die reformierte Konfession und noch mehr die Sekten sich stärker geöffnet haben als das Luthertum. „Die aus der Reformation unmittelbar hervorgegangene Herstellung des Christentums und der christlichen Welt ist noch nicht die wahrhaft protestantische; noch nicht diejenige, welche in dem protestantisch-christlichen Prinzip als definitiver Zweck liegt." Erst das moderne Geistesleben hat das reformatorische Prinzip von den katholischen Zügen des Altprotestantismus befreit. Durch die Verbindung mit diesem Geistesleben entsteht der **Neuprotestantismus,** der nicht mehr auf die Erhaltung der Kirche ausgeht, sondern außerhalb ihrer viel „unbewußtes Christentum" anerkennt. **Sein Ziel ist ein umfassender Kulturprotestantismus als innerste sittlichreligiöse Kraft der staatlichen Menschengemeinschaft.**

Rothe gestaltet die ältere liberale Theologie zu einem umfassenden neuprotestantischen Programm um. Er streift alle transzendenten, supranaturalen, asketischen Elemente von Urchristentum und Altprotestantismus ab und erstrebt statt dessen eine volle Identifizierung von Kultur und Religion, von Staat und Kirche. Diese Tendenzen haben auch nach dem Zusammenbruch der älteren liberalen Theologie ihre Lebenskraft bewahrt und sind Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts in der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie wieder wirksam geworden.

Der alte und der neue Glaube.

Von Pastor H. Niedernhoefer.

Allgemeines.

Es soll diese Arbeit keine strikt wissenschaftliche, theologische sein, sondern nur ein Versuch uns auf diesem weiten Gebiet womöglich etwas Klarheit zu verschaffen. Für den christlichen Glauben muß es eine Quelle geben. Diese Quelle ist nicht für alle christlichen Denominationen ein und dieselbe. Wohl sagt man im allgemeinen, daß die Bibel diese Quelle sei, aber es kann nicht geleugnet werden, daß sowohl Tradition als auch die Lehren der respektiven Denominationen in gar vielen Fällen höher geachtet werden als die Bibel selbst. Alle aber berufen sich auch in diesen Fällen wiederum auf die Bibel als die Quelle, aus der sie geschöpft. Wir müssen darum eine klare, bestimmte Auffassung von der Bibel haben, um auch eine bestimmte Stellung einnehmen zu können. Es genügt ja nicht für uns Prediger zu sagen: die ganze Bibel ist Gottes Wort, und an diesem Ausspruch läßt sich eben nicht drehen und deuteln. Das bekennt man allerwärts in der ganzen Christenheit, und doch sind die Bekenner keineswegs einig in ihrer Auffassung, Auslegung und Anwendung derselben im Alltagsleben, ja es scheint, daß gerade die Bibel die Ursache in allen Fällen war, daß man sich trennte, und daß sie auch den alten und den neuen Glauben verursachte. Wie kommt das? Die Abfassung der Bibel umschließt eben eine sehr lange Zeit, und der Verfasser sind viele. Auch kann nicht geleugnet werden, daß dieselben verschiedene Charaktereigenschaften offenbaren. Als Verfasser müssen wir erkennen Priester, die auf strikte Ordnung dringen, Schriftgelehrte, die beweisen wollen, Historiker, die die Geschichte nach ihrer Art beschreiben, Theologen, die in die göttlichen Geheimnisse einzudringen suchen und Propheten, die in der Gemeinschaft mit Gott Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft aufs innigste verbinden und Gottes ewige Pläne der Menschheit mitteilen. Unter diesen Verfassern finden wir dann solche, die zäh am alten kleben und andre, die wir als Idealisten und Reformer bezeichnen müssen. Ja die Verfasser offenbaren:

„Alt ist, wer am Alten bangend klebt, Nicht wagt, aus Altem Neues frei zu formen. Jung (neu) ist, wer nach neuem mutig strebt, mit Freuden lernt, aus Altem Besseres zu formen." Wer könnte leugnen, daß gerade die Propheten vor allen andern zu dieser Klasse gehören. Von den Propheten heißt es darum auch, „sie haben geredet, getrieben durch den Heiligen Geist." Man muß aber nun nicht denken, daß es sehr leicht sei festzustellen, zu welcher Klasse der eine oder der andre der Schreiber gehört. Man wird

finden, daß ein und derselbe Verfasser mehrere Eigenschaften vertritt, aber gewiß ist dann, daß eine besondre Eigenschaft in ganz besondrer Weise hervortritt. Und finden wir diese Tatsache nicht auch noch heute bestätigt? Darum ist es so schwer, mit Bibelstellen diese oder jene Ansicht zu begründen, oder diese oder jene Ansicht, oder Lehre zu beweisen. Es ist eben eine Tatsache, daß man mit der Bibel gar oft gerade das Gegenteil von einer Behauptung eines andern, aufzustellen vermag. Und das ist nicht zu bedauern, es ist gut so, „auf daß sich kein Fleisch vor ihm rühme." Die Bibel ist eben zu reichhaltig, als daß nur einer, oder einige sie völlig erfassen könnten. Sehen wir nun nach

Der Entstehung der Bibel.

Ist die Bibel wirklich inspiriert? Ist überhaupt eine Inspiration denkbar und möglich? Erklären wir die Bibel als **Gottes Wort,** dann bekennen wir damit auch, daß die Bibel inspiriert sein muß, und dieses wieder schließt in sich einen lebendigen Gott, einen Gott, der nicht nur das All geschaffen hat, sondern auch einen bestimmten Plan mit seiner Schöpfung haben muß und darum auch Wege und Mittel besitzen muß, diesen seinen Plan seinen Geschöpfen und zwar den Menschen mitteilen zu können. Nun sagt aber Jesus von Gott Joh. 5, 37: „Ihr habt nie seine Stimme gehöret, noch seine Gestalt gesehen." Wenn das aber der Fall ist und auch sonst noch reichlich durch die Schrift bezeugt wird, wie hat sich dann Gott geoffenbart? Wollte man aber eine Offenbarung nicht annehmen, dann müßte streng genommen man auch die Möglichkeit einer Entwicklung verwerfen. Es müßte dann im Fall der Menschheit der erste Mensch der vollkommenste gewesen sein, mit aller Weisheit begabt, mit allen Kräften ausgerüstet, so daß kein späterer Mensch ihn in irgendeiner Weise übertreffen könnte.

Dies aber ist nicht der Fall. Die Schüler übertreffen die Lehrer, und dies ist darum der beste Beweis göttlicher Offenbarung, oder der Inspiration. Darum sagt die Schrift so schön und wahr Hebr. 1, 1. 2: „Nachdem vor Zeiten Gott manchesmal und auf mancherlei Weise zu den Vätern geredet hat durch die Propheten, hat er am letzten in diesen Tagen zu uns geredet durch seinen Sohn." Und wie hat er zu uns geredet, wenn doch niemand je seine Stimme gehöret hat? Durch die Propheten und seinen Sohn. Hat Gott diese Propheten sich ohne den Willen derselben auserlesen und sie gleichsam auf die Knie gezwungen und ihnen diktiert, was sie reden und was sie schreiben sollten? Wenn man manche Ausleger älterer und auch neuerer Zeit ernst nehmen müßte, blieb keine andre Auswahl übrig. Das aber widerspricht aller Vernunft und Wahrheit.

2. Petri 1, 21 lesen wir: „Denn es ist noch nie eine Weis-

sagung aus menschlichem Willen hervorgebracht, sondern die heiligen Menschen Gottes haben geredet, getrieben von dem Heiligen Geist." Es waren also besondre Menschen und diese Menschen werden „Heilige" genannt. „Suchet so werdet ihr finden" und „dem Aufrichtigen läßt es Gott gelingen." Doch auch dieses Suchen hat seine Bedingungen. Paulus macht das klar in Römer 1, 19. 20: „Denn daß man weiß, daß Gott sei, ist ihnen offenbar, denn Gott hat es ihnen offenbaret, damit, daß Gottes unsichtbares Wesen, das ist seine ewige Kraft und Gottheit wird ersehen, so man das wahrnimmt an seinen Werken, nämlich der Schöpfung der Welt, also, daß sie keine Entschuldigung haben."

Dies aber fordert Arbeit, Suchen, Forschen und Denken und nur wer dazu Freudigkeit hat und aus der Wahrheit ist, empfängt göttliche Offenbarungen, wird inspiriert. Und nur auf solche Weise wird der Mensch der Herr der Schöpfung nach 1. Mose 1, 28. Solche Inspirationen hören nie auf, sie sind auch heute noch eine Tatsache und ebenso wahr, wie vor alter Zeit. In der lebendigen Gemeinschaft mit Gott liegt die Bedingung der göttlichen Offenbarung. Aber

Welchen Zweck hat denn die Offenbarung?

Sie ist gewiß nicht um Gottes willen, damit Gott in die rechte, ihm gebührende Stellung im gesamten Universum gesetzt würde. Gott bedarf für sich keines Geschöpfes, „er ist sich selbst genug." Sie geschieht um unsertwillen. Sein Wesen soll und muß in unserm Leben einen Widerklang finden. Wir müssen ihm gleich werden, oder „vollkommen sein, wie unser Vater im Himmel vollkommen ist." Der ganze und der alleinige Zweck der Inspiration ist die allmähliche Entwicklung und endliche Vollendung aller Dinge, „auf daß Gott sei alles in allem." Die Erkenntnis dieser Inspiration ist wie die Inspiration selbst keineswegs von Anfang an klar erkannt und zum Ausdruck gebracht worden, auch sie wuchs zur größerer Vollkommenheit, wie die Schöpfung und die Erkenntnis der Schöpfung sowie die Gesetze derselben, oder der Natur selbst. Die Zentrale aller Offenbarung ist Jesus, in welchem „alle Fülle der Gottheit leibhaftig wohnt." Es kann darum auch niemand und nichts zur Vollkommenheit ohne Jesum gelangen. Wenn wir aber nun sagen, daß Jesus die Zentrale aller Offenbarung ist, dann bekennen wir auch damit, daß es in der Offenbarung Unterschiede geben muß.

Das heißt nicht alles, was in der Bibel steht, ist von gleichem belanglos sind. Man macht also einen Unterschied, man wählt. Wert und hat gleiche Bedeutung. Ja es gibt Abschnitte, die ganz persönlicher Art sind, andre wieder, die nur lokale und zeitliche Bedeutung haben und darum für andre Völker und andre Zeiten

Darum hat man gesagt: Nicht die Bibel als solche ist Gottes Wort, sondern Gottes Wort finden wir in der Bibel. Diese Tatsache war dann wohl die Ursache, und es scheint sie ist es noch bis heute, daß man sich nicht einigen konnte, ja daß man schon gar oft mit der Bibel in der Hand die allergrößten Ungerechtigkeiten, ja Schändlichkeiten zu verteidigen suchte. Und so wurde dann die Bibel in solchen Fällen nicht die Quelle des Lebens und Segens, sondern sie wurde ein Götze und Tyrann, unter dem große Teile der Menschheit schwer leiden mußten. Und damit komen wir nun zur eigentlichen Behandlung unsers Themas. Denn es wäre gar nicht zu verwundern, wenn das bisher gesagte nicht schon in dem Herzen des einen oder andern einen Widerspruch angeregt hätte. Denn eben die persönliche Stellung solchen Fragen gegenüber zeitigt, wie man sich nun einmal so auszudrücken gewöhnt ist, den alten und den neuen Glauben. In unsrer Zeit redet man aber lieber von: Fundamentalismus und Modernismus. — Es handelt sich in unsrer Zeit hauptsächlich um drei Streitfragen: 1. Inspiration, 2. Jesus Christus, a. göttliche Zeugung. b. Erlösung, 3. Wiederkunft Christi und Gericht.

1. Inspiration.

Die Anhänger und Verteidiger des alten Glaubens sagen: Die Bibel ist Gottes Wort und sie fordern, daß ein jeder Christ solches bekennen sollte und auch dabei bleiben. Solche aber finden wir nicht in einer besondern, von allen andern Kirchengemeinschaften abgesonderten Gemeinschaft, sondern wir finden solche Anhänger in allen Denominationen. Dieser Fundamentalglaube aber hat die Anhänger desselben keineswegs miteinander so innig verbunden, daß sie auf Grund der Heiligen Schrift ein völlig einheitliches Bekenntnis gefunden hätten. Und fragen wir nun, warum ist das noch nicht geschehen, so werden wir wohl kaum zu einem andern Schluß kommen können, als daß ihr Bekenntnis nicht in allem der Wahrheit entspricht. Die Anhänger des alten Glaubens sind sehr individueller Art. Sie sind nicht einmal in einer und derselben Gemeinschaft imstande, eine geschlossene Einheit zu bilden. Bei genauerer Prüfung werden wir finden müssen, daß es fast in jedem einzelnen Fall immer wieder besondre Stellen der Schrift sind, die man lieber hat als andre und auf Grund derselben sich eine Anschauung geschaffen hat, die mit andern nicht ganz in Einklang gebracht werden kann. Dies ist ganz natürlicher Weise besonders der Fall bei besonders begabten Persönlichkeiten, und da dieselben imstande sind, ihre Ansichten genau zu definieren und aufs beste zu verteidigen, so folgt daraus abermals, daß neue Gemeinschaften gegründet wurden. Aber etwas anders wurde damit noch nicht geoffenbart: sie alle beweisen, ob sie es wollen oder nicht, daß nicht die ganze Bibel das geoffenbarte Gotteswort ist, sondern genau

genommen nur das, was ihnen persönlich am besten in ihr System paßt. Wann hat diese Art der Arbeit begonnen? Wir können getrost sagen: Sie begann mit der Formulierung des religiösen Glaubens und Lebens. Davon zeugt die Bibel selbst.

Warum die Kämpfe der Propheten? Warum ihre Leiden? Wer waren in diesen Fällen die Anhänger des alten und wer die Anhänger des neuen Glaubens? Man denke an Christus! Wurde er nicht beschuldigt, die Sitten und Gebräuche, Gesetz und Propheten aufzulösen und das Volk zu verführen? Und wer beschuldigte ihn? Waren es wohl die Anhänger des neuen oder des alten Glaubens? Und was taten die ersten Christen auf jener ersten Kirchenkonferenz zu Jerusalem? Sie erklärten ein von Gott verordnetes, für das Volk Gottes für alle Zeiten geltendes Institut, nämlich die Beschneidung, als „ein Joch auf der Jünger Hälse," Acta 15. Und dasselbe geschah gegnüber dem Sabbath, der doch ein Zeichen zwischen Gott und den Menschen für alle Zeiten sein sollte. Und folgen wir dann weiter dem Entwicklungslauf der Kirche. Wir wollen nur einiges hervorheben.

Hat nicht Dr. Martin Luther das von ihm nach seinem eigenen Bedürfnis und nach seiner Erkenntnis gefundene Evangelium höher als alles andre geachtet und darum auch alles, was dem zu widersprechen schien, kurzerhand als völlig gleichgültig bezeichnet, ja sogar von „der strohenen Epistel des Jakobus geredet und geschrieben?" War er ein Verteidiger des alten oder des neuen Glaubens? Es ist ferner eine Tatsache, daß, mit nur ganz wenigen Ausnahmen, die gesamte Christenheit den Schöpfungsbericht, in bezug auf die Schöpfungs**tage**, nicht mehr wörtlich versteht, auch hat sich die Kirche, ohne Schaden zu nehmen, ganz ruhig darein gefunden, daß die Erde sich um die Sonne und nicht die Sonne um die Erde dreht. Es gab aber eine Zeit, da eine solche Lehre als fundamental angesehen und verfochten wurde und man fürchtete, daß durch Verleugnung dieses Glaubens die ganze christliche Religion sicherlich dem Verfall entgegen gehen würde. Was ist also der alte Glaube in bezug auf die Inspiration? Fragen wir, um nur einige Kirchenkörper zu nennen, die Katholiken, die Lutheraner, die Reformierten, die Baptisten, die Methodisten, also alles anerkannte bedeutende Kirchenkörper. Fragen wir ferner die sogenannten Sekten und welche Antworten werden wir bekommen? Was ist Gottes Wort? Welche Teile der Schrift sind über alle Zweifel erhaben wirklich Gottes Wort? Wer hat das Recht solches zu bestimmen? Welche Teile sind die bedeutendsten, welche von besondrer Wichtigkeit? Welche Teile müssen wörtlich, welche symbolisch und welche geistig verstanden werden? Die des neuen Glaubens, die Modernen, gestehen ganz offen: Angesichts aller dieser Tatsachen kann keine Kirche für irgendein Glied zu irgendeiner Zeit eine feststehende, über

alle Zweifel erhabene und darum für alle bindende Regel und Gebot aufstellen. Es muß dem Gewissen und der Erkenntnis des Einzelnen die Freiheit des persönlichen Urteils zugestanden werden. „Ein jeglicher sei seiner Meinung gewiß."

Daß auch die Anhänger des neuen Glaubens ebensowenig eine Einheit bilden, wie die des alten, ist ebenfalls bekannt und auch gar nicht zu verwundern. Es ist ferner gewiß, daß eine große Anzahl derer, die mehr dem alten Glauben zugeneigt sind, ohne Gewissensbedenken gar vieles aus dem neuen Glauben sich aneignen könnten, wie auch umgekehrt viele Anhänger des neuen Glaubens doch noch unentwegt am wahren guten alten Glauben festhalten. Es blieben dann nur auf beiden Seiten die äußersten Extreme. Und die hat es immer gegeben. Aber ist denn alles nun so verschwommen, gibt es denn gar keine Gewißheit? Die Gewißheit muß in der **Wirkung** der Inspiration, oder sagen wir in der Kraft des Wortes Gottes im persönlichen Leben des Einzelnen gesucht werden. Nur dann, wenn uns das Wort Gottes, welche Stelle es auch sein mag, in die innigste Gemeinschaft mit Gott selbst durch Christum gebracht hat, so daß wir sagen können: „Ich lebe, aber nicht ich, sondern Christus lebet in mir," nur dann hat die Schrift für mich oder den Leser ihren Zweck erreicht, nur dann erfahren wir, was die Kraft und Herrlichkeit des Wortes Gottes ist. „Der Buchstabe tötet, der Geist aber macht lebendig." Unter solcher Zucht des Geistes wird die Bibel nicht veralten, nicht aufhören, das bedeutendste Buch, das Buch aller Bücher zu sein. Es wird unaufhörlich die reichste Quelle für alle Erkenntnis bilden, aber auch die Kraft offenbaren, alle Dinge neu zugestalten. Und das allein ist der Zweck der Inspiration.

2. Jesus Christus.

Wohl keine andre Frage greift tiefer in das Leben der Menschen und vor allem in das Leben der christlichen Kirche hinein als die Frage: Was dünkt dich um Jesus, weß Sohn ist er? Mit ihm steht und fällt das Christentum. Tatsache ist aber nun, daß alle Kirchen, ja auch alle sogenannten Sekten Jesum anerkennen und zu aller Zeit anerkannt haben. Und nicht allein die Kirchen und Sekten, sondern auch sogenannte religionslose Vereinigungen und selbst viele Heiden erkennen die Größe und Bedeutung Jesu willig an und zollen ihm große Ehre. Wenn das aber der Fall ist, warum streiten sich dann die Menschen und besonders die Anhänger des alten und des neuen Glaubens in betreff seiner Person? Warum verwirft man andre Bekenner als Nichtchristen, da sie doch Jesum ehren? Die Kirche bekennt eben: „Jesus Christus ist wahrer Gott und wahrer Mensch in einer Person." Und die Verteidiger des alten Glaubens sagen, dieser Spruch kann und darf niemals ge-

ändert werden. Ein jeder Versuch an der Richtigkeit dieses Spruches auch nur im geringsten zu zweifeln, löst die Gemeinschaft mit der Kirche und untergräbt die Autorität Jesu. Das führt uns zu

a. der göttlichen Zeugung Jesu.

Um diese zu beweisen, beruft man sich natürlicherweise auf die Bibel. Als besondre Schriftstellen führt man an: Matth. 1, 18—25; Lukas 1, 26—38; Joh. 1, 1—5. Und außer diesen Stellen gibt es noch eine Unmenge andrer Stellen der Schrift, die ebenfalls als Beweis angeführt werden können. Es wird ferner darauf hingewiesen, daß nur der reine, sündlose Gottessohn, der von keiner Erbsünde, noch persönlicher Sünde, etwas wußte, Gott auf Erden vertreten und das Lamm Gottes, welches der Welt Sünde trägt, sein konnte. Nur Jesus Christus, wahrer Gott und wahrer Mensch, paßt in das christliche Religionssystem. Alles dies aber konnte in Jesus nur zutreffen, wenn er nicht auf dem natürlichen Weg der Zeugung durch einen Mann, sondern durch Gott selbst gezeugt wurde. Jesus muß eine Neuschöpfung sein. Alle weiteren Schlußfolgerungen sind uns ja gut bekannt, darum wollen wir uns nicht länger dabei aufhalten. Mit diesem Bekenntnis sind aber die Verteidiger des neuen Glaubens nicht in voller Harmonie. Einige weichen nur in wenigem, andre in mehr Punkten von obigem ab. Was sind deren Gründe? Bedienen sie sich nur der Vernunft, oder gebrauchen sie auch die Bibel als Beweis für ihre Stellung? Sie gebrauchen beides. Sie gehen von dem biblischen Begriff der **Gotteserkenntnis** aus und dabei berufen sie sich auf das alte wie auch auf das neue Testament. „Höre, Israel, der Herr unser Gott ist ein einiger Gott," „von ihm, durch ihn und zu ihm sind alle Dinge." Sie gebrauchen vor allem das Wort aus dem Mund Jesu selbst, Joh. 17, 3: „Das ist aber das ewige Leben, daß sie dich, daß du **allein** wahrer Gott bist und den du gesandt hast, Jesum Christum, erkennen. Sie berufen sich ferner auf viele Verheißungen im alten Testament, in welchen von dem Messias, Christus, gezeugt wird. Er wird „Abrahams Same" genannt, von ihm zeugt Moses im 5. Buch 18, 15: „Einen Propheten, wie mich, wird der Herr, dein Gott, dir erwecken, aus deinen Brüdern, dem sollt ihr gehorchen." Sie rufen den Psalmisten zum Zeugen auf Psalm 2, 7: „Du bist mein Sohn, **heute** habe ich dich gezeuget." Sie berufen sich ferner auf Jesus selbst, welcher fortwährend seine Abhängigkeit von dem Vater bezeugte. Alles, was er besaß, war eine Gabe von seinem Vater, alles, was er tat, war seines Vaters Werk und geschah durch des Vaters Macht. Das alles, sagen sie, ist doch genügender Beweis, daß Jesus wohl Gottes Sohn ist, der einzigartige, der, in dem alle Fülle der Gottheit leibhaftig wohnet, dem alle Gewalt gegeben ist, im Himmel,

wie auf Erden, aber damit nicht auch zugleich **wahrer Gott** von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit. Das kann allein nur Gott selbst sein. Sie sagen ferner, daß das das übereinstimmende Zeugnis auch der Jünger ist und der Bibelstellen gebrauchen sie viele und um dem ganzen die Krone aufzusetzen, berufen sie sich auf 1. Kor. 15, 28, da Paulus bezeugt, daß nachdem alles untertan geworden ist, auch Jesus selbst untertan sein wird. Sie gebrauchen auch die Vernunft, behaupten aber, daß sie bei dem Gebrauch auch wieder der Schrift Gehorsam leisten. Sie verwerfen die Idee der unbefleckten Empfängnis. Dabei berufen sie sich zuerst auf 1. Mose 1. 28 und sagen, keine Empfängnis ist an und für sich eine befleckte, sondern ein Akt des Gehorsams des göttlichen Gebotes. Sie sagen weiter, daß alles Entstehen des Lebens ein Werk Gottes sei und durch Luther schon so anerkannt und ausgesprochen wurde: „Ich glaube, daß Gott mich geschaffen hat samt aller Kreatur," und dies wird in der Bibel in besondern Fällen ausdrücklich hervorgehoben. Man denke vor allem nur an Sarah im Alten und an Elisabeth im Neuen Testament. Sie wurden beide Mütter von Kindern der Verheißung ganz gegen die allgemeinen Gesetze der Natur. Ja die ganze Erzählung der Verheißung und der Geburt des Johannes ähnelt in auffälliger Weise der des Herrn Jesu. Bei Jesus aber macht man die Jungfrauschaft geltend. Es kann nun aber auf die katholische Kirche hingewiesen werden, welche auch eine unbefleckte Empfängnis bei Maria annimmt. Wo wäre nun der Anfang, wo das Ende? Sie gehen noch einen Schritt weiter und fragen: Welcher Akt bei der Empfängnis ist der sündliche, nur der des Mannes oder auch der des Weibes? Sagt nicht die Schrift, daß durch das Weib die Uebertretung in die Welt gekommen ist? 1. Tim. 2, 14. Auch wird Joseph von Maria selbst mehreremal der Vater Jesu genannt. Es bliebe dann eigentlich nur die Stelle in Matthäus zur Beweiskraft für die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu übrig. So stehen denn auch in dieser Frage die Anhänger beider Teile einander gegenüber, und ein jeder Teil kämpft mit der Bibel in der Hand. Wer kann nun recht haben? Wird diese Frage überhaupt von einem Menschen je klar und über alle Zweifel beantwortet werden können? Und wem steht das Recht zu den Bruder zu verdammen? Ist die ganze Frage eine solche die verstanden oder nur geglaubt werden muß? Wenn letzteres der Fall ist, muß man dann nicht an die Worte Pauli sich erinnern, der doch so sehr auf den Glauben pocht: „Und wenn ich **allen** Glauben hätte . . . . und hätte der Liebe nicht, so wäre es mir nichts nütze?" Ist nicht ein **Leben** erfüllt von dem Geist Christi, willig zum freudigen Dienst an den Brüdern von größerm Wert als ein rechthaberischer Streit, der wohl kaum je zur vollen Zufriedenheit gelöst werden kann? Darum „richtet nicht, auf daß ihr nicht gerichtet werdet."

Aufs engste mit dieser ersten Frage ist die zweite unter dieser Rubrik verbunden.

b. Die Erlösung durch Christus.

Auch inbezug auf diese Frage geht man weit auseinander. Der a. G. sagt, der Mensch als solcher ist völlig unter der Macht der Sünde und darum verloren. Er kann sich nimmer selbst erlösen. Ueber ihm waltet ein ewiger Fluch. Er kann weiter nichts tun zu seiner Erlösung als dieselbe als ein Gnadengeschenk Gottes nur annehmen. Gott muß nach seiner ewigen Gerechtigkeit den Sünder verdammen und von dieser Verdammnis kann der Mensch nur durch den Opfertod Jesu, als das Lamm Gottes, erlöst werden. Zur Bestättigung dieser Behauptung oder Lehre beruft man sich auf das Vorbild in der Opferung des Isaak, auf die Erhöhung der ehernen Schlange in der Wüste, auf die gesamte Einrichtung des Opferdienstes im Alten Testament, auf die Zeugnisse der Propheten, vor allem Jes. 53, und auf die Zeugnisse Jesu und der Apostel. Und diese Zeugnisse sind so reichhaltig, scheinbar so über alle Zweifel erhaben, daß man kaum begreifen kann, wie ein Mensch noch andrer Meinung sein kann, oder gar noch gegenteilige Beweise aus der Bibel erbringen könnte.

Aber trotz aller dieser Beweise hat man doch schon in früheren Zeiten und noch mehr in unsrer Zeit an der Richtigkeit der Beweise und der Schlußfolgerungen gezweifelt. Wie für so viele andre Erscheinungen im religiösen Leben der Christen hat auch hierzu wieder die Bibel die Veranlassung gegeben. Der Mensch kann eben nicht für alle Zeiten und unter allen Umständen auf nur blinden, gehorsamen Glauben seine religiöse Ueberzeugung aufbauen. Der denkende Mensch fordert Gründe für seinen Glauben, er fordert Erkenntnis. Die Bibel ist aber nicht nur für einige wenige ein offenes Buch, sie ist ein Buch für alle und der Herr fordert: „Suchet in der Schrift." Wäre aber alles in der Bibel einfach und verständlich, dann brauchte man weder zu suchen noch alles zu prüfen. Auch bezeugt die Bibel, daß Gott der Gott aller ist, der Juden und Heiden und in unsrer Zeit, der Fundamentalisten und der Modernen. Die Bibel wird nicht aufhören Wunder zu wirken, auch Wunder der Erkenntnis. Auch ist nicht zu vergessen, daß wir noch immer durch einen Spiegel sehen, daß noch nicht erschienen ist, was wir sein werden, daß unser Glaube immer noch Stückwerk ist. Und was für neue Anschauungen haben nun die Anhänger des neuen Glaubens? Sie gehen von inneren Gründen, Gründen des Lebens und der Erfahrung aus, und an der Hand derselben prüfen sie die Bibel. Sie fragen: Ist es wirklich wahr, daß der Mensch weder durch Lehre noch durch Vorbild, sondern allein durch

das vollgültige Opfer in dem Leiden und Sterben Jesu Christi erlöst werden konnte? Und sie fragen ferner: Ist der Einzelne sowie die Gesamtheit denn wirklich erlöst? Ja sie fragen, was bedeutet denn im vollen Sinn die Erlösung? Ist es nicht die Erlösung von dem Fluch der Sünde? Der Fluch der Sünde aber ist die Macht des Fleisches und infolge davon die Früchte des Fleisches, siehe Gal. 5, 19—21. Und das wieder ist der Ausschluß aus dem Reich Gottes. Sind die Früchte des Fleisches etwas Unbekanntes unter den Christen? Sind wir erlöst, regiert der Geist die Christen? Sind die Christen zu einem neuen Leben hindurchgedrungen? Und wenn einige Menschenkinder aus der großen Menge der Menschheit ja selbst der sogenannten Christenheit zu einem reineren Leben hindurchdringen, geschieht solches ganz ohne ihr Zutun? Und wenn dem so ist, warum geschieht es nicht an all den unzähligen, die jahraus jahrein Gelegenheit haben das Wort der Gnade zu hören? Ist es wirklich wahr, daß **nur** durch das vollgültige Opfer Jesu Christi wir erlöst werden? Zeugt nicht die eigene Erfahrung und die ganze Geschichte der christlichen Kirche dagegen? Es kann gewiß nicht an Gott liegen, denn Gott will, daß allen geholfen werde und an Gottes ewiger Liebe kann auch nicht gezweifelt werden, wohl kann auch an seiner Allmacht. Kann da nicht irgendwo der Fehler bei uns Menschen liegen? Sollte darum der Mensch nicht berechtigt sein, etwas tiefer zu graben? Sie suchen in der Schrift und behaupten eine völlig neue Erkenntnis gefunden zu haben. Sie mag aber am Ende gar nicht so völlig neue sein, ja sie mag sogar die ursprüngliche ewige Wahrheit sein. Die Begriffe göttlicher Eigenschaften werden dadurch in Frage gestellt. Sie stellen manches um. Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes muß der Barmherzigkeit und Liebe Gottes als den größeren Eigenschaften weichen. Gott handelt gleichsam mit den Menschen nach jenem Spruch: Psalm 103, 14: „Er kennet, was für ein Gemächte wir sind, er gedenket daran, daß wir Staub sind." Und das erkannte nicht nur der Psalmist, darin stimmen auch fast alle Propheten mit überein. Darum verkündigen sie, daß Gott nicht durch das Blut der Ochsen, der Kälber und Böcke versöhnt werden könnte. Ja Gott will nicht einmal solche Opfer. Psalm 50, 9. 13; Psalm 51, 18; Jes. 1, 11, und damit vergleiche man sorgfältig Hebr. 10, 5–9. Wenn nun Gott, nach seiner Barmherzigkeit und Liebe, wohl wissend, was für ein Gemächte wir sind, schon das Blut der Tiere nicht forderte, wie viel weniger wird er wohl das Blut eines Menschen und dazu eines unschuldigen fordern können? Und beim weiteren Forschen in der Schrift finden sie, daß Gott das Vergießen des Menschenblutes als einen Greuel bezeichnet, 5. Mose 18, 10, 2. Kön. 16, 3 und 2. Chron. 28, 3. So folgern sie denn: Wenn Gott trotz seiner Gerechtigkeit und Heiligkeit das Vergießen von

Menschenblut verurteilt und als Greuel kennzeichnet, wie kann derselbe gerechte und heilige Gott selbst Menschenblut zur Sühne seines Zornes fordern? Sollte nicht, wie bei einem Weib, dem Kind gegenüber, die Barmherzigkeit siegen? So erkannten es die Propheten. Sie reden darum von der **Barmherzigkeit Gottes,** die einen andern Weg seiner Versöhnung sowie der Erneuerung des Menschengeschlechtes gefunden. Man lese nur Jes. 43, 24. 25; 44, 22; Jer. 31 und Hes. 36, 26 ff. Und auf Grund dieser Stellen des Alten Testaments suchen sie weiter im Neuen Testament. Und was sie hier finden, bestätigt, was im Alten Testament bezeugt wurde. Sie gedenken an die Gleichnisse des Herrn, vor allem an das vom verlorenen Sohn, in welchem ja eben die Barmherzigkeit des Vaters, wie sie die Propheten von Gott verkündigten, in so wunderschöner und ergreifender Weise uns vor die Augen gemalt wird. Sie lesen ein andres, Luk. 20, 1—17. Sie erinnern sich der Worte Jesu am Kreuz: „Vater, vergib ihnen, denn sie wissen nicht, was sie tun." Und sie finden bei weiterm Forschen, daß Petrus Acta 4, 17 dieselbe Erkenntnis hatte und Paulus schrieb an die Korinther, 1. Kor. 2, 8: „Hätten sie den Herrn der Herrlichkeit erkannt, dann hätten sie ihn nicht gekreuzigt." Und das scheint doch klar zu bestättigen, daß Paulus nicht daran gedacht haben kann, daß Jesus nach Gottes ewigem Rat hat sterben müssen. Und als eine noch viel wichtigere Stelle finden sie Hebr. 2, 10. 11: „Es geziemte dem, um deßwillen alle Dinge sind, der da viele Kinder zur Herrlichkeit geführet, daß er den Herzog ihrer Seligkeit durch **Leiden vollkommen machte.** Sintemal sie alle von einem kommen, der da heiligt und die da geheiligt werden, darum schämet er sich auch nicht, sie Brüder zu heißen." Damit vergleiche man Phil. 2, 5—11. Dies alles nun in Betracht ziehend, kommen sie zu folgenden Schlüßen: Jesus ist der Sohn Gottes, der einzigartige, über allen andern Kindern Gottes (vergleiche Röm. 8) hoch erhaben, der **vollkommene Menschensohn,** der uns ein Vorbild gelassen, daß wir sollen nachfolgen seinen Fußtapfen, der keine Sünde getan und in dessen Mund kein Betrug erfunden wurde. Dieser vollkommene Gottessohn kam in sein Eigentum, die Seinen nahmen ihn aber nicht auf. Ihre Blindheit, ihre völlige Ohnmacht, ihre Verkehrtheit und ihr gänzlich verdorbenes Wesen ist so unaussprechlich tief gesunken, daß sie aus falscher Selbstsucht, sich so weit vergaßen, daß sie den Herrn der Herrlichkeit kreuzigten. Jene Menschen aber sind nur ein kleiner Teil und Vertreter der gesamten Menschheit, denn „keiner lebt ihm selber." Die Menschheit als solche verwirft Jesus und kreuzigt ihn wie damals so durch alle Zeiten hindurch ihre Blindheit und ihren Ungehorsamz. Tiefer kann die Menschheit nicht sinken. Und was tut der Vater, was offenbart das Sterben Jesu? „Wo aber die Sünde mächtig geworden ist, da ist die Gnade noch

viel mächtiger geworden." „Und wenn eure Sünde gleich blutrot ist, soll sie doch schneeweiß werden." Wer unter dem Kreuz die ewige Liebe seines Gottes nicht findet und erkennt und darum in den Staub sinkt und aus der Tiefe seines Herzens zu Gott schreit, der wird wohl auf keine andre Weise den Weg zum Vaterherzen finden können. Hier heißt es aber nun auch, „ein jeglicher sei gesinnt, wie Jesus Christus auch war," und „wer mein Jünger sein will, der verleugne sich selbst und nehme sein Kreuz auf sich und folge mir nach." Hier gilt es der Sünde und dem Verderben und der Macht der Sünde sterben, wie auch Jesus gestorben. Nur so kann dann auch der Mensch zu einem neuen Leben auferstehen. Hier lernt er die volle Wahrheit: „Schaffet, daß ihr selig werdet, mit Furcht und Zittern, denn Gott ist es der in euch wirket, beides das Wollen und das Vollbringen." Das Kreuz wird dann zu keinem sanften Ruhekissen, sondern die wirkliche Lebensquelle. Ob die Anhänger eines solchen Evangeliums wohl so verkehrt sind und die Bibel so falsch verstehen, daß man sich mit Abscheu von ihnen wenden muß, mag doch noch eine andre Frage sein. „Prüfet alles, das Gute behaltet."

3. Die Wiederkunft Christi und Gericht.

Wir werden nun schon zur Genüge erkannt haben, daß man mit der Bibel in der Hand nicht nur eine, sondern viele Anschauungen beweisen kann. Das gilt auch wieder inbezug auf die Lehre der Wiederkunft Jesu. Der alte Glaube hält daran fest: „Von dannen er wiederkommen wird, zu richten die Lebendigen und die Toten." Und sie gehen einen Schritt weiter und sagen, sie muß wörtlich und leiblich verstanden werden. Und des Herrn Wiederkunft wird geschehen zu einer Zeit des größten Abfalls, der größten Verwüstung auf Erden. Die Bibel redet von Krieg und Kriegsgeschrei, von Erdbeben, von Trockenheit und andern schrecklichen Heimsuchungen und Trübsalen, welche kein Mensch aushalten könnte, wenn sie nicht um der Auserwählten verkürzt würden. Darum wird den Menschen auf Erden bange werden. Es werden dann Zeichen an Sonne und Mond geschehen und dann wird der Menschensohn kommen. Daraus wird nun, und man glaubt mit vollem Recht, der Schluß gezogen, daß alle Versuche der Menschen, auch recht guter Menschen, Verbesserungen zu schaffen, ganz bestimmt fehl schlagen müssen und darum weigert man sich, irgendwelche soziale oder nationale und internationale Bestrebungen zu unterstützen. Es muß, so schließt man weiter, in der letzten Zeit auf Erden immer unerträglicher werden und dann wird der Herr kommen. Dies alles ist die Ursache des hartnäckigen Widerstrebens recht ernstlicher Christen, wenn sie aufgefordert werden, in diesen oder jenen Bestrebungen ihre Hilfe doch darzureichen. Sie können es aus Ge-

wissensgründen nicht tun. Und man vergißt, daß das Gewissen eben erzogen werden muß. Die Hoffnung der Wiederkunft Christi lebte sehr stark in den Aposteln und den ersten Christen. Der Tag des Herrn war für sie nahe. Und seit der Zeit war fort und fort die Sehnsucht fast aller aufrichtiger Christen auf das Kommen des Herrn gerichtet. Die Stellen der Schrift, welche von der Wiederkunft redeten, wurden mit besondrer Sorgfalt gelesen und gar bald konnten kluge Berechnungen angestellt werden, Zeit und Stunde der Wiederkunft des Herrn nach gewissen Bibelstellen bekannt gemacht werden. Große Vorbereitungen zum Empfang des Herrn wurden dann getroffen — aber der Herr kam nicht. Und so ist es bis auf den heutigen Tag noch immer eine falsche Rechnung gewesen, die man machte. Liegt eine Möglichkeit vor, daß man sich auch in diesem Punkt getäuscht haben mag, wie in so manchen andern? Ist es möglich, daß man gewisse Bibelstellen falsch verstanden hat? Solche Fragen stellten wieder die Verteidiger des neuen Glaubens. Sie gehen frisch ans Werk, weil sie nach Gewißheit ringen. Täuschen sie sich in ihren Berechnungen, oder ihrem Verstehen, so wird das die Zukunft offenbaren. Der erste Grund ist, der Herr ist noch nicht leiblich wiedergekommen. Und dem fügen sie nun recht dreist hinzu, er wird auch noch lange nicht leiblich wiederkommen. Sie sagen mit dem Herrn: „Zeit und Stunde weiß niemand, auch des Menschensohn nicht, die hat Gott seiner Macht vorbehalten." Sie stellen dann ferner ein Wort des Meisters in das Zentrum dieser Frage. „Der Herr hat gesagt zu meinem Herrn, setze dich zu meiner Rechten, bis daß ich deine Feinde zum Schemel deiner Füße mache." Sie legen dabei vollen Nachdruck auf die Worte **„bis daß."** Die Ueberwindung der Feinde soll aber nicht durch Heer oder Macht, sondern durch innere Ueberzeugung geschehen, so daß die Feinde zu willigen Dienern werden, zu solchen, die freudig ihre Knie vor ihm beugen und mit ihren Zungen bekennen, daß er der Herr sei zur Ehre Gottes des Vaters. Sie verweisen auf andre Stellen und geben gerne zu, daß der Herr kommt, aber nicht persönlich, er kommt auch zum Gericht, aber dieses Gericht liegt in den Händen seines Volkes. Und nach der Beschreibung dieses Gerichtes, Offb. 18, ist das Gericht so vollständig und so alle Verhältnisse auf Erden umgestaltend, daß von den alten Zuständen kaum noch ein Rest übrig geblieben ist. Es soll auch Krieg und Kriegsgeschrei verstummen nach Jes. 2 und Micha 4. Das alles aber muß das Werk der Jünger Jesu **vor** dem Kommen des Herrn sein und daneben noch vieles andre. Ist das aber schon geschehen? Haben wir einen neuen Himmel und eine neue Erde, in welcher Gerechtigkeit wohnt? Wir sind, wie offenbar ist, noch weit davon entfernt, und eben darum wird auch der Herr noch nicht kommen. Noch auf einige andre Andeutungen

soll hingewiesen werden. „Der Herr hat noch andre Schafe und die muß er auch herzuführen, so daß eine Herde unter einem Hirten werde.“ Dieses wunderbare Werk aber hat er von Anfang an seinen Jüngern befohlen. Wie weit sind wir davon noch entfernt? Sodann lesen wir Jer. 31. 34, daß das große Werk Gottes, die Neuschöpfung der Herzen, einen solchem Erfolg haben wird, daß die Menschheit ohne ein religiöses Institut Gott ehren wird und den Brüdern dienen. „Es wird keiner zu seinem Bruder sagen, erkenne den Herrn, sie werden ihn alle erkennen.“

Nur so viel mag hier angeführt werden. Und zu dem allem werden sie geführt, besonders durch ein Gleichnis des Herrn Lukas 14, 16—23. Auch hierin ist wichtig: „**Nötigt** sie herein zu kommen.“ Dies alles offenbart eine neue, ganz besondre Art, die Bibel zu lesen. Und infolge davon kommen sie zu dem natürlichen Schluß: „Wirket, so lange es Tag ist, denn es kommt die Nacht, da niemand mehr wirken kann.“ Es ist die Aufgabe der Jünger des Herrn, nicht müßig am Markt zu stehen und auf das Kommen des Herrn zu warten, sondern alle Kräfte anzuwenden, Gottes Reich zu bauen, dem Herrn, die ihm gebührende Stellung in allen Lagen menschlichen Lebens zu sichern. Der Herr, dem alle Gewalt gegeben ist, muß nicht nur im Himmel herrschen, sondern eben so sehr auf Erden. Alle Reiche müssen des Herrn werden. „Ihr sollt meine Zeugen sein,“ und „ihr werdet größere Werke tun, denn ich.“ Es liegt an uns, auf welche Seite wir treten wollen, und wie viel wir von der einen oder der andern Partei für uns persönlich aneignen wollen. „Der Herr aber sucht nicht mehr an den Haushaltern, als daß sie treu erfunden werden.“

Und nun noch eine kurze aber sehr bedeutsame Frage: Welche christliche Denomination und welches christliche Bekenntnis wird wohl in der Zukunft den größten Einfluß ausüben und infolge davon auch zum größten Segen werden? Zu diesen Fragen werden wir genötigt durch die gewaltigen Vorgänge in der ganzen Welt und besonders den großen Missionsgebieten. Man sagt uns, wir wollen Christus aber nicht **euer** Christentum. Man könnte wohl kurz antworten: Diejenige Denomination, welche durch Wort und Tat Christus am nächsten steht. Doch was bedeutet das? „In Wort und Werk und allem Wesen sei Jesus und sonst nichts zu lesen.“ Aber auch das schließt unendlich viel in sich.

Ich will nur einige Striche in dieser Richtung ziehen. Wir werden daraus sofort erkennen, daß sie unsrer ganzen Gesellschaftsordnung direkt widersprechen. Jesu ganze Stellung in der Welt, während seiner Lebenszeit, muß die Stellung aller wahrer Christen werden. Er bekannte, daß Gott der Vater aller ist, der Guten und der Bösen, darum erbarmet er sich auch aller seiner Werke.

Vor ihm gilt kein Ansehen der Person, Reiche oder Arme, Weiße oder Braune, Gelbe oder Schwarze, Gebildete oder Ungebildete, nein, Vorzüge gibt es nicht, gibt es aber solche, dann sind es in der ganzen Welt die Armen, denen das Evangelium gepredigt wird. Den Armen, den Enterbten galt seine ganze Liebe und Fürsorge, und klar machte er es, daß eher ein Kameel durch ein Nadelohr gehen könne als ein Reicher ins Reich Gottes (was man aber heute ganz gewiß nicht mehr glaubt und noch viel weniger predigt), „was hoch ist vor der Welt, das ist vor Gott ein Greuel." Aus allem dem geht dann seine weitere Stellung hervor, **kein** Mensch hat **persönliche Eigentumsrechte,** auf die wir doch alle so stolz sind, und die wir mit Leib und Seele verteidigen, wir alle sind **nur Haushalter.** Die Erde ist des Herrn und ein jeder Haushalter muß dem Herrn Rechenschaft geben über seine Haushalterschaft und wehe, wenn die Hungrigen nicht gespeist, die Durstigen nicht getränkt und die Nackenden nicht gekleidet werden.

Wehe, wenn wir Unterschiede machen, uns gerne grüßen lassen und gerne oben ansitzen, als besondre Größen in der Gesellschaft, oder aber als Angehörige einer großen Nation in der Völkerwelt. Man denke nur an solche Worte wie Imperialismus oder Kapitalismus. Und dann frage man sich allen Ernstes: Auf welcher Seite stand Jesus? Wo er stand, müssen wir stehen, und haben sie ihn Beelzebub geheißen, dann darf es uns nicht wundern, wenn sie uns auch so heißen. Das heißt neben vielem andern: „In Wort und Werk und allem Wesen sei Jesus und sonst nichts zu lesen."

EDITORIALS

WILL IT BE LUTHER OR CALVIN?

Protestants have always been strong on disagreeing, on upholding personal opinion, on contending for intellectual integrity. That has been one secret of their success, they have furnished the leaven that started the dough of humanity into ever new processes of growth and activity. It seems no accident that the leading nations of the world have largely been Protestant.

Still the Catholic Church survives and is as powerful as it ever was. Authority that could enforce unity has held it together, and the strange combination of its inflexibility with a certain adaptability has again and again been the despair of its opponents.

Protestantism has at last learned the lesson that Rome in God's providence is destined to inculcate, namely, the lesson of the *one,* holy, *universal* Christian church. The organization of the *Federal Council* of the churches of Christ 20 years ago was an indication that American Protestantism was beginning to read the signs of the times. But the Federation of churches in the Council was for practical purposes only, it did not rest on uniformity of creed or affect the independence of the individual churches. More pretentious was the movement that called many Protestant churches together in Philadelphia in 1918, to consider ways and means for an *organic union* of all Protestant faiths. It was a by-product of wartime enthusiasm, and it had no sooner flared up than it died down again.

Since then there have been efforts for consolidation on a more modest scale. The Lutherans have combined three formerly independent bodies in the United Lutheran Church; and in Canada Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists have founded the United Church of Canada.

Our own Synod has not remained untouched by the wind that has been stirring in the tree tops. To afford a spiritual home to those to whom Luther and Calvin were both servants of the same Lord, was its great ideal. It has never expected that it would convert all Lutherans or all Reformed of this country to this principle. In the days of its very beginning it encountered from extreme Lutheranism a hostility so bitter and so uncompromising that it would have blighted that hope had it ever been there. On the other hand, to win over the Reformed never even occurred to it. It was an

importation from Germany, and in Germany the Reformed are a negligible quantity. They have developed, in the Western provinces, a vigorous church life, but the original stock from which our immigrants were drawn, did not come from there. The expectation of our fathers was that those who had brought from their old home a mild Lutheranism or a softened Calvinism might find with us just what they wanted. Our growth in the first period of our history was such that we had no reason to think that our principles had not sufficient drawing power. According to Schory ("Geschichte . . . ") we had in *1888 55,000* families under our care. At six heads a family—then a modest scale—that meant over 300,000 souls. In the early nineties we grew again considerably, but when immigration stopped, we stopped to grow. In the last 25 years our numbers have remained more or less stationary.

In the mean time, however, we have grown to be largely an English-speaking body and have sought and found a *place* in *American Protestantism*. According to size we rank only fifteenth, or thereabouts, on the roll of American Protestant churches. In other words, we find that we are one of the less significant denominations. Hence the complaint that we have made no "appreciable contribution to American Protestantism." It would never have occurred to our fathers to grieve about that, for, first, they lived in days of phenomenal growth, and, second, they *did not expect* to make an impression on American Protestantism. Largely Lutheran in spirit, they were satisfied with the culture of the religious life; to impress the world with the numbers, the schools, the theology, the literature of the church, much less with its power in legislation and politics, would have seemed utterly *worldly* to them. They never tried to assert themselves, they were satisfied if they were left alone.

This somewhat quietistic spirit of the fathers was bound to be greatly modified by our immerging into the vigorous flow of American church life. The American churches are largely Calvinistic. By that we do not mean that they have Calvin's theology, least of all his predestinationism. We have in mind his emphasis on life rather than on doctrines; on work more than on faith; the freedom of the church from the state; the influence of the church on public life; the aggressive and assertive spirit of Calvinism in general. This spirit entered into a natural fusion with the genius of a vigorous race on a new continent, and the two together have produced the American church. More and more it has shed the swaddling clothes of orthodox theology and judges everything by the pragmatic test: does it work, will it pay? Long enough has the church wasted time on metaphysics, now let her show what she can do to give ful-

ness of life to the individual and to realize the Kingdom of God in this world.

Our own Synod feels the pull of these vital forces. Our younger men, especially, are eager for her to heed the challenge of the new age. They are afraid if she persists in her policy of isolation, other churches will draw together and get strong and she will be left alone, bewailing her short-sightedness when it is too late and seeing before her the unenviable fate of gradual decay. What can we do under these circumstances, so asks R. Niebuhr (in his letter to the Editor, last January), to let in new blood and take a more creditable place in American Protestantism? He says, we can *unite with* the *Reformed Church*. They are a kindred body; they are probably willing; and, together, we should have 600,000 communicants.

N. knows well that our Synod, more Lutheran than Reformed in spirit, feels more drawn to Wittenberg than to Geneva, but, he says, the Lutherans don't want us. He is right in this. Only recently the Editor conferred with a representative man from the United Lutheran Church and was told that an organic union with them would be out of the question; there might possibly some sort of a looser relation be found, etc. There is not the shadow of a doubt but that the Synod and the Lutheran Church will not mix.

So if we want to unite, the Reformed Church is the only possible chance. Niebuhr made this suggestion once before, in 1919, and met with vigorous opposition. Many perhaps have not changed their attitude. All those of Lutheran lineage or leaning would strenuously insist that the *unionistic principle be not sacrificed* in a possible merger. If, for instance, the Reformed demanded the adoption of their name in the new denominator, that would seem to bar an agreement. The "United Evangelical Church of America" might satisfy the Evangelicals, but how would it strike the Reformed?

The Editor cannot commit himself on the question; he knows too little of the Reformed Church. It appears to have shared with us the fate that, so far, it has not contributed much to American Protestantism. If it had, our union with them would probably be in the nature of an absorption. This writer could get along with, and even in, the Reformed Church; he was brought up in it, although confirmed in the Lutheran church (in Germany).

At any rate, it would not hurt us to enter into negotiations with the Reformed. We could then more intelligently judge what a union with them would mean to us in obligations and in privileges.

WHY DOES THE JEWISH RABBI THROW THE PROTESTANT MINISTER IN THE SHADE?

We trust we shall not be considered provincial when we frequently get our clue for an Editorial from local conditions. The American public is, on the one hand, a combination of many nationalities, on the other hand, various factors have welded it to a surprising degree into homogeneity. The public school, political institutions, the press have done conspicuous service in creating a feeling of solidarity. A hundred million people live together on one continent with no barriers to political or commercial intercourse. This fact has made possible mass production in all commodities. To render this production cheap, nearly everything we produce has been standardized. Our papers, comics, movies, theatres, automobiles, patent medicines, styles of architecture, radios, etc., are the same all over the country. As a result we all live alike, read, think, build alike. One city is largely like every other, except in size; and conditions in one part of the country are very much the same as in others. What is, therefore, true of Cleveland is true of other large cities and of cities not so large.

In Cleveland the rabbis, or some of them, are the greatest drawing card to the general public, and, so we believe, they are in New York, Chicago and Philadelphia. We have two distinguished rabbis here, Silver and Brickner. Wherever they appear they speak to crowded houses. Of the 200 Protestant ministers here there is not one who would even remotely compete with them in popularity and influence. They speak at civic functions, high school exercises, lodge festivals, in women's organizations, and even in Protestant churches. And when they do speak it is an event and the papers take due notice. Why can the rabbis do what the ministers cannot do?

In the first place, of course, it has to be stated that only the two men mentioned are so conspicuously successful. The rabbis as a class are more or less in obscurity. Those two are the leaders of two very wealthy congregations, drawing salaries of something like $30,000, it is said. They are therefore probably the pick of their class, and the more money you pay the stronger the man you get. Still, there are wealthy Christian congregations here, paying also large salaries, whose ministers are little prominent.

Is then the Jewish race possessed of such talents that it is hopeless for other races to enter into competition with them? It is true these two rabbis far outshine our own local men in oratorical gifts. I heard R. Silver, on Armistice Day, deliver an oration that far surpassed any Protestant minister I ever heard here. Yet, the

history of oratory by no means awards the crown to the people of Israel. Demosthenes, Cicero, Mirabeau, the elder Pitt, Burke, D. Webster, Beecher were all sons of other races.

The reason must possibly be sought in other quarters. There is a wide-spread indifference today to questions of creed and dogma. Protestant people have been fed upon these things in the past. Now the reaction is strong in the direction of a one-sided emphasis on life and principles. People don't care about a man's faith if he only lives right. The important thing is not whether he is Protestant, Catholic or Jew, but whether he is an honest man. Let every man have what religion he prefers, but let him be sincere. If religious people can't agree on what they believe, let them work together for the establishment of a better world. Even many Christian ministers (Cadman, Lichliter, etc.) say, give up trying to convert the Jew; rather cooperate with him in making a better community.

The Jewish rabbi, of the liberal sort, agrees exactly with that philosophy. He is a theist, he believes in a personal God. R. Brickner, in the near future, is going to debate here with Clarence Darrow on the question, Is man a machine?—the rabbi taking the negative side. When belief in God is given and admitted, the rabbis are willing to let other things slide. They believe in historic religion. They are convinced there is inspiration in their own history; but bear in mind, they are not looking for the coming Messiah any more. They reject Jesus as the divinely given fulfiller of messianic hopes, but they are not expecting any other either. In some way they hope to draw powers of revival from their history, their faith, from science and literature, from all the sources German "Idealism" sought and seeks to draw from. So it can be seen that to a large extent they are in harmony with the tendencies of the modern mind; and because they are and are eloquent exponents of it, they get a hearing.

They talk, by the way, little of religion; only in a general way. They talk, however, of the social implications of religion—and their people allow them great freedom in chastising capitalism and materialism—of literature; the latest "best seller" in fiction or philosophy; of civic subjects; companionate marriages; woman's rights, etc. They never convert any one to Judaism. Yet they make themselves heard in public life, and enjoy it; and their people are proud of them.

The Christian minister, if nature has denied him equal gifts, would be foolish to be envious of the rabbi. But if he is a minister of *Christ* he would be handicapped in the race even if he had the gifts.

Ist Christus „primus inter pares"?

Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule gibt bekanntlich den Anspruch auf, daß die christliche Religion die absolute sei. Sie habe allerdings den bisher höchsten Stand religiöser Entwicklung erreicht, aber niemand könne sagen, daß eine Weiter- und Höherentwicklung in der Zukunft außer dem Bereich der Möglichkeit sei. Das erinnert an das Diktum der ihr vorausgehenden spekulativen Theologie, daß es der Idee nicht beliebe, ihren ganzen Inhalt in ein einzelnes Individuum auszuschütten.

Die religionsgeschichtliche Anschauung hat ihre sehr praktischen Konsequenzen auf dem **Missionsgebiet.** Ist die christliche Religion nicht die absolute, dann geziemt uns, andre Religionen mit viel mehr Unparteilichkeit zu studieren und zu beurteilen. Sie mögen uns weniger zusagen, aber ihren Anhängern um so mehr. Christus ist der Lehrer des Okzidents, aber hat nicht der Orient, der ihn hervorgebracht, andre Namen, die ihm, Christo, an Glanz wenig nachstehen? Wir denken heute so viel dem **Mystischen** in der Religion nach: wo aber ist der klassische Boden des Mystischen als im Orient?

Man erinnert sich, daß nach dem Russisch-Japanesischen Krieg viele die Ueberzeugung aussprachen, daß das siegreiche Japan kaum das Christentum annehmen werde ohne große Abstriche und Modificationen; als wäre es zuviel verlangt, daß diese gelbe Rasse den Heiland der weißen akzeptieren werde, ohne daß er sich vor dem Kaiser und seinen Ahnen verbeuge. Seit dem hat aber wenigstens die Missionswelt ihr Gleichgewicht wieder mehr gewonnen. Es war uns aus der Seele gesprochen, als bei der diesjährigen Pastorenkonferenz in Columbus (über 1100 Pastoren anwesend) der altbewährte Missionsmann Dr. **R. Speer** es klar und deutlich aussprach, daß bei dem Kommen des Evangeliums zu den Heiden **Christus nichts** von andern Religionen **borgt,** daß in ihm die ganze Fülle der Gottheit wohnt. Es gebe keine absolute Rasse, sagte er, aber das Christentum ist die absolute Religion. Nicht als wenn irgendeine Kirche den Inhalt der Wahrheit schon völlig ausgeschöpft habe; aber er ist da und tritt mehr und mehr ans Licht. Missionsmethoden, -anschauungen, -praxis müssen vielfach sich dem erwachten Nationalgefühl heidnischer Völker anpassen. In heidnischen Religionen müssen mehr Anknüpfungspunkte mit der christlichen gesucht und ausgebeutet werden. Aber Christus ist der Heiland der Welt, nicht Buddha oder irgendein andrer.

Es war herzstärkend, Speer aus eigener Anschauung beschreiben zu hören, wie sich Christus und sein Evangelium **durch den Tatbeweis** als das Heil auch dieser Heidenvölker erweist. Man spricht in Indien oft von „Reischristen," von solchen, die das Christentum um seiner äußeren Vorteile annehmen. Dem gegenüber

betonte Speer, daß das erste, was die Kirchen in Japan erstreben, ist, sich finanziell unabhängig zu machen. Sie haben Selbstachtung und Ehrlichkeit genug, daß sie lieber darben als Unterstützung annehmen. Ihre eingeborenen Pastoren leben von unglaublich kleinem Gehalt, aber wie der Apostel haben sie gelernt, Mangel zu leiden, und wie er erstatten sie, was fehlt, durch die Arbeit ihrer Hände. Noch wunderbarer war, was er von ihrer Lernbegierde erzählte. Im Norden des Landes besuchte er in abgelegener Gegend einen Dorfpastor, dessen Gehalt 30 Dollars das Jahr betrug. Aber in seiner Bibliothek fand Speer Werke von oder über Kant, Spinoza, Ottos „Das Heilige," Sohms Abriß der Kirchengeschichte, Keyser, Evolution und zahlreiche andre Werke dieser Art; alle in englischer Sprache. Und wie geistig vorwärtsstrebend, so sind sie geistlich treu und heldenmütig. Wie einst jenes Christenmädchen sich weigerte, auf dem Altar der Diana ein wenig Weihrauch zu streuen, obwohl man ihr sagte, sie verleugne ihren Glauben nicht, es sei nur eine Konzession an lokale Gebräuche, so weigert sich heute der japanische Christ, dem Kaiserkultus auch nur die geringste Akkomodation zu machen, obgleich es nur für einen Akt der Loyalität gelten soll.

Aehnliche Beispiele erzählte er von Korea und seinen heroischen Christen. Es war beschämend für amerikanische Christen, mit solcher Hingabe, solchem Opfermut, solchem Zeugengeist ihre eigene Mattherzigkeit zu vergleichen.

Aber es ließ das Feuer des zuversichtlichen Glaubens neu aufflammen, daß der Christus, der solches heute im fernen Asien tun kann, nicht bloß „primus inter pares," sondern der Eingeborene Gottes ist, und daß die Stunde immer näher rückt, wo auch die Heiden in seinem Licht wandeln werden. Wie nach Paulus die Heiden die Juden reizen sollen, in die Nachfolge Jesu einzutreten, so kann heute die Missionswelt der alten Christenheit ein Sporn sein, die erste Liebe nicht zu lassen und wieder zu tun die ersten Werke.

The Christian World

Methodist Conference on Evangelism

The Christian Advocate, New York, November 24, 1927

More than 1,000 ministers and laymen of Troy, Northern New York, Central New York and Genesee Conferences met in First Church, Syracuse, N. Y., for the first Buffalo Area Conference on Evangelism, November 10 and 11, Bishop Adna Wright Leonard presiding.

Bishops Berry, Mead, Smith and Henderson assisted Bishop Leonard with the program. Addresses were also given by Dr. H. E. Woolever, editor of The National Methodist Press; Frank Ryder, president of Laymen's Association of Troy Conference; Dr. W. A. Godsave, director of religious education in Northern New York Conference; and Dr. James S. Baker, director of Wesley Foundation. Every phase of evangelism was covered by the speakers.

Significant pronouncements of some of the speakers were as follows:

Bishop Leonard: "Too many churches want a pastor who is a crowd-getter, but are not concerned about his being a soul-winner." "Behavioristic psychology is becoming a detriment to Christianity." "Man must have a spiritual experience which no psychologist can explain." "Christ the Lord must be real to us as a personal Saviour." "As ministers and laymen we must lay aside the unimportant and give ourselves unreservedly to this one business of getting men to God."

Dr. Godsave: "We must understand the spiritual needs of childhood and youth in order to build an adequate program of religious education. By proper surroundings, program and teaching, we shall bring them to know the truth, to love it more than life itself, and then to give outward expression of it."

Mr. Ryder: "Much of our trouble results from weakness of will. God can strengthen our wills. Only the power, the love and the knowledge of God can save the world."

Dr. Woolever: "In the early days of Methodism it was the rule that each member should get another member every year. In 1926 the Methodist Episcopal Church did not register a net increase of one member for each minister." "The printed page, which has always played an important part in the program of Methodism, is still an indispensable asset in the evangelistic activity of the Church."

Bishop Smith: "As Jesus was tempted to use His power for wrong ends, so the Church and the ministry today are often tempted to misuse their authority and power for material ends. The greater the power, the greater the temptation. God has protected the Church from a misuse of power, however, for when we misuse power, we lose God, and without God there is no power." "The greatest emphasis must not be placed on social Christianity. The first task of the minister is to get men to Christ. The minister has a complex character.

He must be a priest, a prophet, a teacher, an executive, and he must face the total task confronting him, having a balanced program."

Bishop Mead: "Methodism lost 18,000 members last year, while other interests have grown by leaps and bounds. But youth is the world's fresh start. Age lives in reminiscence, while youth lives in prophecy. There is a close relationship between childhood and God. We emphasize the physical preparation for parenthood. It is much more important to stress the spiritual preparation of these who are to nurture the souls of little children. It is the business of the Church to create a proper climate for the development of the spiritual lives of youth."

Dr. Baker: "The youth of today are placing a new emphasis upon religion. They are hungry for the release of spiritual power."

Bishop Henderson: "Either communicate your religion or change it. The evangelistic task is not exclusively a ministerial profession. The laymen must share the responsibility. We cannot disseminate Christianity unless God disseminates us. . . . The Ephesian revival is a good guide for our present-day evangelistic endeavors. Get the laymen organized and working; give place to the Holy Spirit through prayer; make a visitation from house to house; have special meetings where men can make decision and accept Christ. Put your heart into the task. There is a relation between the tears of Jesus and the resurrection of Lazarus, and there is a relation between the tears of Paul and the bonfire at Ephesus."

A findings committee summed up the convictions of the delegates in a report from which we quote:

Our Call to Evangelistic Work

"Evidently the heart of the Church is hungering for God. And upon us the seal of the Holy Spirit has rested during every session. Our area has faced the challenge to undertake a real program of evangelism. We are confident that the challenge will be met, and that on every district and in every Church, winning people to Christ and building them up in Christ will be the chief emphasis. We call on all our ministers and laymen to join heart and soul in the Spiritual Crusade.

"Agreed we are that back of all effective evangelistic methods, and before we may expect an increase in the fruits of our ministry, there must be a new evangelistic mind. We therefore do not declare for any specific method, but rather for a definite consecrated purpose, believing that we should be all things to all men, willing to use this method or that, as the Spirit may lead in the circumstances.

"We seek the fellowship and co-operation of our brethren everywhere who will join with us in searching for the will of God. To this end we ask the General Conference of 1928 to give first and foremost consideration to those means of grace which will be most effective in carrying out the paramount mission of the Church, the saving of the lost.

"Likewise, we seek the definite and purposeful co-operation of all the agencies of the Church. We ask that our editors and publishing

agents give special emphasis to the preparation and circulation of tracts, leaflets, books and literature which will be of a definite evangelistic character and urge our pastors to make a larger use of these proven means of Christian culture. We pray that those at the head of the schools and colleges fostered by our denomination give special stress to the claims of Jesus Christ upon the youth of today. We urge all the boards and commissions of our Church to so direct their activities during the next quadrennium as to give special emphasis to evangelism. We commend the advancing program of religious education, with a stress upon definite decisions for Christian discipleship, and especially do we urge that the children of our constituency be brought up to attend and profit by the regular worship services of the Church.

"Praying that God will send anew a revival passion upon the Church, the spirit of our conference has indicated that each of the hundreds of laymen and ministers making up this body has offered the prayer: "Our Fatner, begin this revival in me."

The Third Annual Catholic Conference

The Living Church, Milwaukee, November 5, 1927

It is noteworthy and significant that the Catholic life, not Catholic ceremonial, was emphasized throughout the Congress. The Bishop of Albany in his address of welcome, the Congress preacher in his sermon at the solemn High Mass, and the chairman in his introductory address dwelt upon holiness.

It is fitting at the beginning of a report of the Congress to quote earnest words from the chairman's opening address, from the address of welcome, and from the Congress sermon.

The Rev. Frank L. Vernon, D.D., rector of St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia, chairman, said: "Of unity, holiness, catholicity, apostolicity, we are moved to select the note of holiness for emphasis. . . It is high time we had an unfaltering belief in holiness, an unswerving allegiance to standards of living which are above debate. . . . Fasting communion is more important than High Mass. Confession is more important than incense. . . . First of all we must have holy priests, holiness must be their first concern. Sacraments and prayer must be the chief business of our parochial life. Our churches must be above all else houses of prayer. Ritual must be adequate, but it must above all things be sincere. Worship must be in spirit and in truth."

The Rt. Rev. Richard H. Nelson, D.D., Bishop of Albany, in welcoming the delegates, said: "We are assembled here because of our devotion to Him in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in whom the children of men find eternal life. . . . The saints represent a great spiritual fellowship who have sought to know Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The dominating purpose of their lives is the same as that which has drawn us together, and we shall not depart from the truth if we define the Catholic Church as the company of All Saints who are joined in sacramental union with Him who is the spiritual Head of mankind."

The Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., rector of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York, and Congress preacher, continued this appeal for holy living:

"Catholicity is not and cannot be an individual thing. It is social, and the true Catholic is an energetic force for righteousness in the community to which he belongs. He is a Christian citizen. He is visualizing all questions from a Christian point of view. Not only is teaching the Christian religion an obligation we have accepted, but at the same time we have accepted the serious obligation of living it.

"I would appeal to Anglo-Catholics on that platform; the platform of a Catholic life. That we should make it impossible that we be any longer known as those who indulge in certain ceremonial habits which would be harmless did they not indicate a certain Romeward tendency, or lay stress on certain doctrines which are unusual in the Episcopal Church; but as those who stand first of all for certain fundamental principles of living, to whom holiness is the supreme quality and vocation of the Christian, the reason of his existence and the condition of his attainment to his end."

The Rev. Charles Jarvis Harriman, rector of the Church of St. James-the-Less, Philadelphia, definitely defended the Catholic position on commonly raised questions, and his defense led to the larger position of loyalty to our Lord. "The sum of it all is," he concluded, "that our loyalty is not only to a cause or to an organism but to a personal Christ, the Son of God."

Fr. Harriman said the loyalty of the Anglo-Catholic group in the Episcopal Church had been called in question.

"We believe and do these things, not because they are Roman, but because they are right. They are more than Roman, they are Catholic, and the Episcopal Church is Catholic. Its name is Protestant Episcopal, but protestant is a word of various meanings. It was used of the ancient Church of England. At the Reformation she was not made new, but made free. To the jibe—where was your Church before the Reformation? the retort is—where was your face before it was washed?

"If by protestant you mean disowning papal obedience, sharing the movement for freedom, education, and individual development; public worship in English; the open Bible; we are Protestant. If you mean anti-catholic, especially in the spirit of the sheet and hood, every man to choose his own Church, a complete break with the past, the dilemma between fundamentalism and modernism—if you mean by protestant what most Protestants seem to mean, we are not protestant, and God forbid we ever should be.

"The men who named the Protestant Episcopal Church meant to keep to the historic Church, as they showed by the Prayer Book. They were Episcopal, retaining bishops as had been since the apostles' time, but protestant in doing so apart from the papal system; protestant in the English sense, successors of established episcopacy, not dissent. Episcopal, the name by which we are commonly known, defines our position. Protestant describes so well what we are not, it is barely honest to use it. We should drop the word Protestant, and

put nothing in its place, and be known as the Episcopal Church."

The Rev. Julian D. Hamlin, rector of St. John's Church, Newport, R. I., read a paper, The Nature of the Church. Fr. Hamlin adequately traced the natural growth and historic development of the Church, but eloquently portrayed the Divine Society which he suggested must seldom have been absent from the mind of Jesus.

"What did our Lord leave behind Him? Not a book, but a record of His life, not a creed; but a fellowship of men and women bound to each other by a common allegiance to Him and by a victorious faith in His resurrection. It was to this fellowship that the baptism of the Holy Spirit came on Pentecost.

"Immediately the little Church was obsessed by a divine sense of mission, regarded herself as the fulfilment of the old order, possessed new coherence and unity, more adequate than the prophets ever dreamed.

"The chief glory of the Book of Common Prayer is that it has never allowed us to forget that our membership in Christ involves membership in a Christian body which is far larger than the Protestant Episcopal Church, of which the Anglican communion is but a part, and which it has never repudiated by any official expression of its mind."

The Solemn High Mass

On Wednesday morning at 10:30 the solemn pontifical Mass in the Cathedral of All Saints was the climax of the Congress. At the close of this impressive service, the congregation of 2,500 people who thronged the cathedral knelt and received the blessing of Bishop Nelson as he proceeded through the aisle.

The Sessions of the Second Day

The Rt. Rev. Campbell Gray, D. D., Bishop of Northern Indiana, whose subject was The Faithful Departed, made tender reference, before reading his paper, to the beautiful and unforgettable speech made by the late Bishop Brown at General Convention in New Orleans when he rose to plead for the practice of prayers for the dead, suggesting no more appropriate place and time than in the very center of the Holy Communion service.

Bishop Gray gave a very clear and simple explanation of the intermediary state of the departed. The prejudice against the word "purgatory," he said, originated from the abuses which clustered about this doctrine, purgation in reality being remedial and not vengeful. He said the arguments against prayers for the dead would be equally valid against prayers for the living. "The highest act of prayer is sacrifice," said Bishop Gray. "As for the living, so also for the dead, the most powerful thing we can do for them is to offer the Holy Sacrifice at the altar."

Our Lady and the Saints

Our Lady and the saints, having been turned out of our churches about four hundred years ago, and the doors slammed behind them, came back through the windows." Thus the Rev. Spence Burton, Superior S.S.J.E., prefaced his admirable paper, Our Lady and the

Saints. He suggested practical methods for putting his theories into practice, such as shrines with votive candles at images and windows of the saints. Particularly he suggested praying for missionaries at the shrines of great missionaries, "and there lighting candles in honor of Him who is the Light of the World." He distinguished clearly between *latria* and *dulia*. A fine feature of this paper was the plea for Christian fellowship, cultivated and nurtured by companionship with the saints and prayerful concern for the poor, the sick, the needy, the submerged, and the oppressed.

At the Wednesday evening session the Ven. John Cole McKim, with Fr. Sakurai, S.S.J.E., representing the Church in Japan, brought greetings from the Catholic Congress there. The Rev. Robert E. Wood, of the China mission, spoke as a representative of the Holy Catholic Church of China.

Lawson Purdy, L.L.D., secretary and general director of the Charity Organization Society, New York, expressed satisfaction in the growing desire of theological seminaries to give instruction in social work, as the clergy ought to be informed concerning social resources and problems. "Forty years ago I thought it was the duty of the clergy to preach the rights of man. I thought the message of freedom and justice so appealing that when stated it would be accepted. I saw men suffer for that belief and saw their ministry wrecked. Now I believe the clergy should first have regard for their ministry to individual souls and avoid such public utterances as may lessen their usefulness for their primary priestly function. Within these limitations they should embrace such opportunities as they may have to further the rule of right."

Dr. Purdy developed the fundamental principle of sacrifice and pain and of happiness through perfect adaption to environment.

The Missionary Charter of the Church was the subject of the paper by the Rev. Robert F. Lau, D.D., of the National Council.

"The Church could not cease to be missionary without ceasing to be. Evangelization was the justification of the existence of the early Church. It grew not by insistence upon faith and order but by missionary zeal. . . . Interest in the missionary program of the Church is the acid test of the claim to be Catholic. We must justify our existence as Catholics by sharing in the missionary enterprise of our communion. Otherwise we have a name that we are living but are dead."

Dr. Lau put some very pertinent questions, such as the desire at home for paid choirs and the desire in China for hospitals.

Two College Presidents

Kenneth C. M. Sills, LL.D., president of Bowdoin College, read a paper on The Church and Education. He spoke strongly in favor of the religious day school and of the realization it gives children that the community is interested in religious instruction, albeit the whole plan is yet experimental. He referred to the attempt to get rid of parochial schools as thoroughly vicious and un-American. He referred also with a degree of satisfaction to the faculty of the Church for

private schools and suggested that they should include children from a greater range of homes, especially those of working men. He likewise referred to our Church colleges as being distinguished for graduating men of real culture.

"It is a mistake to treat the college student as a type and not as an individual. He needs a priest for the same reason the rest of us do. . . . Laymen as well as clergy should try to keep more in touch with the religious life of boys and girls in college. Frequently they have no hint that people take the least interest in their Church relations, hence is it any wonder they feel religion is of no particular importance?"

Dr. Sills emphasized the great and perennial need of better training for the Christian ministry:

"We should strive to make our theological seminaries equal to other schools of medicine, law, science, and business training. The type of men studying for Orders is improving, but stronger men should be encouraged. We need to pay more attention to the scholarship of teachers in our seminaries. . . . It is the fault of the Church that not more men are devoted to scholarship. We provide no means for scholarly men to live scholarly lives, and the Church cannot hold its own without scholarly leadership."

Following Dr. Sills, the president of St. Stephen's College, the Rev. Barnard I. Bell, D.D., read a paper on The Church, the College Student, and Morals.

"Confused thinking and confused talking undermines the respect of undergraduates for so-called Christian morals. It is futile to attempt to make people live like Christians when they are not Christians. We live in a pagan world as did the Lord Jesus Christ and as did St. Paul. Christians are now and always have been and probably always will be a minority. What is right for others is not right for us, and what is wrong for us may not be wrong for them. We should say to the student, If you wish Christ's grace, if you believe He is the way, the sustainer and lover of souls ,then accept only the ethical judgment of those who through the centuries have lived near Him and learned about Him. . . . The way to change the undergraduate's morals and to ensure that he shall continue to maintain the standards of Christendom is to make him a Catholic Christian—and there is no other way in the world."

The Rev. Charles Townsend, Jr., rector of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Rosemont, Pa., read a paper, Saints in the Making. "If we want to be saints we have the power to become saints. The real enemy of our spiritual life is commonplace dullness of routine and the lack of desire for the life of prayer and devotion. This is demonstrated by the disregard of daily Mass and the disinterest in holy days. . . . We who call ourselves Catholic Christians need to make much more of the good old evangelical truth of assurance, the keynote of true evangelicalism, without which there can be no true Catholicism. . . .

"The Episcopal Church will continue to nurture respectable Chris-

tians but will never make saints until in every parish and mission, every city and hamlet, she restores the Sacrament of the Altar to the central place in her worship. . . . The need, the purpose, the only goal of the Christian religion and therefore of the Catholic is to make saints in the image and after the likeness of the sacred humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Conclusion

The official report of the registration of the Congress is that 1,033 persons were enrolled, while many unregistered persons attended the various sessions.

There were eight altars in the cathedral and Masses were said from 6 to 9 o'clock daily. There were communions at 7 and 8. On Thursday a requiem Mass was said in the chapel of St. Michael and All Angels for Bishop Lines, at which the Rev. C. N. Lathrop was celebrant.

A concert was played on the new municipal carillon of Albany specially for the Congress during the noon hour on Thursday.

How Lutheranism Lapsed from Liberalism

The Christian Century, Chicago, November 10, 1927

Miles H. Krumbine

The one question that I am asked more frequently than any other by my non-Lutheran friends goes something like this: "How, in the light of Luther's great freedom of spirit, can you explain the ultra conservatism of the American Lutheran church of today?" Frankly, until I read Dr. Vergilius Ferm's "The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology" I could not explain it. The mental daring, the catholicity of spirit, the marked spontaneity and frank avowal of personal conviction of Luther—especially the Luther of those great days before 1525—always seemed utterly unlike anything I ever knew or experienced in the Lutheran church of my time. This book makes it plain enough. It is really a sad story.

The Lutheran church in the United States began its career under the leadership of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, known as the "patriarch" of the denomination, who came to this country in 1742 to give some kind of coherence to the scattered congregations founded before that date. He brought with him the spirit of the pietistic movement then prevalent in Germany under the direction of Spencer and Francke. The whole passion of that movement was concentrated on practical piety as against the rigid adherence to the symbolic books, especially to the "Formula of Concord" of 1580, which had prevailed hitherto. Not that Muhlenberg in America or Spencer and Francke in Germany renounced the symbolical books. They did not renounce them. They only shifted their center of interest.

In 1792, the Pennsylvania ministerium, the mother synod of the Lutheran church in America, revised its constitution, leaving out not only any reference to the historic Lutheran symbols but also any mention of the Augsburg confession. At the same time, there grew up

a steadfast fellowship with the German Reform church, which gave rise to a great many union churches throughout the east, a fact that continues even today. The New York ministerium called as its second president Dr. F. H. Quitman, a graduate of Halle and a doctor of divinity of Harvard. Dr. Quitman was a frank American exponent of the rationalistic movement that was then taking shape under the Halle professor, Johann Semler.

The year 1818 marks an ejoch in American Lutheran church history. In that year, the first effort was put forth looking toward the organization of a general synod to comprise within its fellowship the various Lutheran synods in the country. When the general synod was finally set up, its constitution contained no mention, either implicity or explicity, of the historical symbolical books of the church; not even the Augsburg confession. It plainly respected differences of opinion, both as to polity and doctrine. It placed on record an earnest desire to welcome any movement looking toward concord and unity of Christians of whatever kind of denomination.

Meanwhile, in 1820, the German Evangelical synod of Tennessee was organized. This event may be taken as the first organized effort to bring the Lutheran church back to a confessional consciousness. While never affiliating with the general synod, this movement set in motion a trend toward confessionalism, which was destined to sweep over the entire American Lutheran church.

Then appears on the scene the greatest figure since Muhlenberg, Samuel S. Schmucker, the founder of Gettysburg college and the founder, first professor and president of the Lutheran theological seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Not only was Schmucker the great theologian of the church, the teacher of something like four hundred Lutheran ministers, but he was a practical statesman as well. It was his effort that saved the general synod from disaster and gave coherence and unity to the American Lutheran church. His influence was the ruling factor in American Lutheranism for more than a generation.

Under the leadership of this redoubtable champion of a liberal interpretation of the historic documents, there was coming into being a very distinct type of Lutheranism which he himself called "American Lutheranism." Meanwhile, the tide of immigration from Germany had set in. These immigrants brought with them the prevailing spirit of their day in Germany. Known in America as "Old Lutherans," they were distinctly different from the American Lutheranism of Schmucker and his followers. They were strictly confessional in character. Newly organized synods now sprang up and grew rapidly. No less than thirty-two were organized in the twenty years between 1840 and 1860.

The individual synods of the general synod found themselves in constant contact with these reactionary groups. In view of the definitely confessional character of their position, it seemed wise to Schmucker and the men associated with him that the general synod take a definite doctrinal position. To this end, he had a hand in draft-

ing an anonymous document known as the "Definite Synodical Platform," and here he made his great mistake.

The definite synodical platform was calculated to give voice to the spirit of American Lutheranism. Its specific point was for a doctrinal basis that would confine itself to the apostles creed, the Nicene creed and the Augsburg confession. The Augsburg confession, however, was presented not as the more confessionally-minded bodies knew it but in an "American recension." In his recension, those elements of the confession that were objectionable to the minds of men like Schmucker were (1) the approval of the ceremonies of the mass; (2) of private confession and absolution; (3) the denial of the divine obligation of the Christian sabbath; (4) baptismal regeneration; and (5) the real presence of the body and blood of the Savior in the eucharist.

A very bitter controversy began to rage immediately. As the time came for the synod to take action on the definite platform, it became obvious that American Lutheranism was doomed. The action of the general synod never turned fairly on the merits of the document because the bitterness of the controversy became so great that the very integrity of the Lutheran church of the general synod was at stake. It became necessary, for the sake of its life, to promote a program of peace and harmony and, in that process Schmucker's work came to naught. By 1857, not only was the definite synodical platform cast into limbo, but the very leadership of Schmucker was utterly rejected; and thus ended the era of American Lutheranism.

It is one of the irionies of life that within ten years after 1857, Schmucker's own son, his brother-in-law and Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth, one o fhis students and an intimate friend, became protagonists of the confessional point of view and the new spirits in the great schism of the Lutheran church. It was during that period that the general council was organized. Meanwhile, the civil war was on that brought into being the general synod of the south. The old general synod continued on its way, nourishing a liberal spirit, at least among a minority of its leaders. In 1918, these three bodies joined in what is now the United Lutheran church of America. It is not unfair to say that, in that union there is left little, if any, trace of American Lutheranism as it was, for the trend in the United Lutheran church is certainly toward an increasing confessionalism.

The Turning Point

America (Catholic), New York, August 27th, 1927

Edward J. Lyng

There are few subjects of ecclesiastical interest in America which offer a wider field for spiritual effort and success, and, at the same time, there is no question vexing the minds of the hierarchy and of the clergy in general that is more acute, than the Italian question.

Apart from personal enthusiasm, the only justification for re-opening a subject which bristles with doubt is the complete change and the undeniable revival which are apparent in all groups of Italian people in America. The casual visitor to an Italian settlement and

the most indifferent tyro in settlement work will advance the same conviction that a change, real, palpable and profound, is going on at the present time among the natives of Italy upon our shores and their American offspring.

Restrictive immigration has been more noticeable and more keenly felt among the Italians than any other class of Europeans who are accustomed to find in America a haven of safety and the golden land of opportunity. For almost four years the law has been in operation, with the result that conditions that prevailed less than a decade ago have changed. Time was when the Italian and his child were segregated and isolated not only geographically and ethnically but even industrially and, sad to say, religiously, so that being thrown back upon the customs of their own country and upon certain familiar practices of religion, they did not actually measure up to the standards of Catholicism or citizenship as conceived in America.

This condition of affairs cannot be said to have really fostered the spirit of religion in the Italian immigrant or his children; as a result, many thousands of them for a superabundance of reasons drifted away from the moorings of religion. Great insistence was and is, perhaps, today laid upon street processions and extravagant devotions about statues, streets in gala array with vari-colored lights and gay festoons of flowers intertwined with the national colors of America and Italy, the vigorous blare of noisy bands that upon every occasion seem to select secular and spirited music in preference to the somber and impressive notes of the religious composers. All these, we claim, had and have a tendency to produce a distinctly artificial relation to the Church and the Sacraments, and to create the impression that the accidental and the non-essential features of religion made up for virtue, piety and the practices of Faith. Let it not be imagined that we decry the outbursts of the patriotic and romantic soul of the Italian as expressed in pyrotechnics, or the sheen and shimmer of the silken flag; but experience has proven that these mere worldly trappings are no substitute for the virile and practical Catholicism of America.

Too great stress cannot be laid upon the essential features of religion while the non-essentials such as parades, street precessions, banners, fireworks, bands and cumbersome statues will be viewed only as the evidences of fervor. Had we more of the former and less of the latter in the treatment of the Italian question during the past fifty years there would be greater fidelity in America upon the part of the Italian and his children and fewer defections.

Despite what might be interpreted as an indictment, we can confidently say that a turning-point has been reached in Italian affairs in our country within very recent times. The restriction of immigration has contributed partially but not entirely. The grace of God is undoubtedly at work and the wholesale assimilation of the Italian and his children to American ways of thinking and acting have also had their share in the visible Church. Not the least among the factors at work in the land is the spirit of Il Duce Benito Mussolini, whose energetis personality and vigorous grasp of international affairs have

done much to strengthen the national pride and the better instincts of his countrymen in this country.

Sufficient examples have been given of Mussolini's sincere desire to stimulate the piety and religious instincts of his people in every part of the world. A few instances may not be amiss. The Italian consul of one of the largest cities in the East, some two years ago, told the writer that upon the occasion of his visit to Italy a year previous, Il Duce told him that the instructions which were given to every Ambassador representing the sovereignty of Italy and to very Consul representing the commercial interests of his Government were that they represented not only the Government but also the religion of Italy. Even more, officials of Italian societies organized in the United States whenever visiting the homeland and favored by an interview with Mussolini were questioned regarding their affiliation or non-affiliation with the Church and were also cautioned that the safety and success of the Italian people in foreign lands depended upon their loyalty to their religion.

It must seem evident from the foregoing that the turning-point so eagerly anticipated for so many years has actually been reached and that rich possibilities of spiritual progress are imminent. A two-fold duty however rests upon the Church. There is first, an urgent need of our American-trained clergy to promote the spiritual revival of the children of Italy located in our country. Not a few will say that this is a radical suggestion. But it is for that very reason that we make it. Bishops throughout the country point with pride to the tremendous success which has attended the efforts of priests born and educated in America. The personal contact is of vast importance in the management of Italian religious affairs. Unlike the descendants of other foreigners, the Italian is not inclined to take the priest on his face value, but the diligence of that priest in the spiritual affairs of his parish, his energetic handling of disciplinary measures and the dignity with which he carries out the ceremonies of the Church soon win for him the unqualified support of those among whom his lot is cast.

The "dispenser of the mysteries of God" must bring the influence of his sacred calling within the family circle, must make himself a connecting link between the child and the Church, and by his interest in the troubles, anxieties, ambitions and even failures of his flock show himself to be a representative of Christ actuated by something higher than earthly gain. Again, he brings to his people a better knowledge of American ideals and the practices of the Church in America than one less familiar with these requisites of present-day spiritual revival.

If ever the harvest was ripe and cried for earnest workers it is today when we realize how the many forces to which the Italian responds are combined in a great renaissance of spiritual activity. We can look around the corner and see for ourselves a glorious religious prospective—if zeal, earnestness, sympathy and Christ-like charity attend our handling of this subject today.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magzaine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

Jesus. A New Biography by *Shirley Jackson Case.* The University of Chicago Press, 1927. 453 pages, $3.00.

Back to Jesus! has been the battle-cry of critical theology for at least a quarter of a century. When Wrede first used it it meant a return from Paul to the Synoptics, from a formulated theology about Christ to the simple pattern of his God-consecrated life, from the Jesus of the creeds to the "Jesus of history." The movement thus inaugurated by no means halted at the synoptic gospels. These gospels, themselves were found to be composed of many sources. The oldest of these were thought to be Mark and Q (= Quelle), the latter being used by Matthew and Luke in common. The portions peculiar to Matthew or Luke represent later accretions, and might be called a sort of "new apocrypha." In the more primitive documents the "Jesus of history" is more correctly portrayed.

Case, of the Department of Church History of Chicago University, the author of this book, goes still further. The picture even in the oldest of documents, he thinks, is also "an artist's creation." "It has to be reduced by removing features that owe their presence to the creative impulses of the author and to be supplemented by information that had escaped the writer's notice." It is to be sure a pretentious and difficult task, at this late date, to give a more correct picture of the historical Jesus than the first Christian writers whose literary products have come down to us. But it must be undertaken, and it can be more or less successfully done by a study of the historical environment in which Jesus lived. No "return to Jesus" is adequate that is not a return to the living conditions of the time. When an author sponsors opinions that are proper more in later situations we ought to be slow to accept their historicity. All records about Jesus ought to be judged by their suitableness to the distinctive environment of Jesus.

The ancient biographies of Jesus as before us in the four gospels survived mainly because of their literary excellency and because they were supposed to be written by apostles. The latter is, however, only partially true. The apostle Matthew is not the author of the first gospel nor the apostle John of the fourth, and Luke and Mark were not apostles, though they were pupils of apostles. Synoptic criticism has shown Mark to occupy the most original position. He furnished the historical framework of Jesus' life, which was adopted by other synoptic writers. Luke and Matthew both used another source, Quelle. "The two-source hypothesis is a return to the real Jesus of history."

In the Quelle-document Jesus is the teacher. Here the religion of Jesus as taught and lived by him held the center of attention. What is outside of Quelle is a late addition, of little historical value.

When we turn to the Acts, the other book ascribed to Luke, we are disappointed in our hope to obtain new light on the life of Jesus. We hear nothing about Jesus' life and teaching. The Acts always speak of the exalted Christ, not of the earthly.

John's gospel is not accepted as a reliable historical source at all. It is a theological treatise, whose aim is to show the divinity of Christ. There is no psychological development either in the mind of Jesus or in those of the disciples. He is the lamb of God bearing the sins of the world, even in the mouth of the Baptist, in the very first chapter. He does not veil his Messiahship as he does in the other gospels, it is pronounced by his very first disciples, on the first day of their acquaintance with him.

Before our first gospels were written there was an earlier stage of oral traditions and written sources, as Luke expressly tells us in the first verse of his gospel. The difficulty to isolate the earthly figure of Jesus as caught in these original sources from later embellishments and idealizations, is great but the task must be undertaken just the same.

The author now proceeds to describe the Jewish life of the time, from which he expects so much light on the problem. Under the galling domination of Rome the "Kingdom of God" became the crucial issue of the hour. Revolution was in the air, but there were also those who counseled against it. Help would come to them only from God's direct intervention. Apocalyptic hope throve in the soil of present distress and prophetic belief. There were religious sects, exclusive and fanatical; but also a process of Hellenization. And when the gospel spread to the Gentile world, Greek ideas crept into the Christian message. The virgin birth, the idea of divine parentage, received strength from contemporary heathen cults. "Matthew and Luke (with their infancy stories) made Jesus at home in the Gentile world." The Gentile gods were heroes, doers of miraculous deeds. The same tendency began to develop in the lives of Jesus. Instead of the teacher he becomes the divine being for whom earthly limitations of any kind do not exist.

The "silent years" of Jesus' life are fully discussed. The results, however, seem to yield little. Jesus had the common man's knowledge of religion and the discipline in the practical school of real life. His life was not that of the Baptist. He lived close to Sepphoris (the later Tiberias) and was well acquainted with urban life. He was no revolutionist, he had seen the futility of opposition to Rome (in the destruction of the rebellious Sepphoris).

John the Baptist's activity brought Jesus upon the scene. John himself did not accept Jesus as Messiah (even long after Jesus' death there were disciples of John, see Acts 19, 1 ff). He was the way-preparer but outside the Christian fold.

At his baptism Jesus has a remarkable experience, a "seizure" by

the divine spirit. He begins to preach. He is largely a prophet trying to awaken repentance, purity of life, righteousness, and faith in God, although the title of prophet later seemed to his followers inadequate. As a representative of the "people of the land" (Am ha-aretz), of the ordinary Jews not belonging to religious sects, he advocates personal and spiritual religion over against ritual and institutionalism. He therefore aroused the enmity of the Pharisees and other sects. These Pharisees, according to the author, were really very well-meaning and nice people, but the later opposition of the Jews to Christianity was read back into the gospel story, and so the Pharisees came to be the bitter enemies of Jesus. "Matthew 23 (the woes upon the Pharisees) is first century Christianity's answer to Jewish opposition." We see the author's estimation of the Pharisees is largely in accord with recent Jewish apologists of Phariseeism.

What is now, the author asks, really the *religion that Jesus lived?* The early Christian writers were not concerned with Jesus' religion, they knew no psychology, knew not the varying moods of highly wrought temperaments. Jesus was to them the object of their devotions, the favored Son of God, the apocalyptic Son of man, the preexistent incarnate Logos. The Jesus of dogma and the Jesus of history were included in the Christian movement from a very early date, certainly soon after his death, perhaps even prior to his crucifixion.

Is this picture correct? asks the writer. The Logia (earliest document) contained hardly any miracles. Still a didactic and a heroic interest are manifest from the beginning. The influence of the heathen world was strongly on the side of the heroic. Asklepios, Bacchus, Serapis, Isis were all healers. "So Christianity claimed the same power for Jesus." "When Mark was written the prerogatives of the risen Christ had been generously conferred on the earthly Christ." All the gospels are overlaid with miracles that answered admirably to the demands of the mission field.

Jesus called himself indeed "the Son of God," but that is a vocational title, not one claiming divine nature. Nor does it mean the Messiah. Messiahship is an achievement of a later development. Even more often he calls himself the "Son of Man." The "Son of Man" was to the Jews the new Messianic deliverer who was to come on the day of judgment. It is highly improbable that Jesus had ever called himself the "Son of Man."

Jesus is said to have veiled his Messiahship in life, but later Christians believed he was the Messiah, and before many years passed they were able to recall supposed words to that effect. The picture of the transcendental Messiah had been no part of the religion of Jesus. He was a prophet conscious of a new and overpowering experience of God and of the obligation this laid upon him.

And *what was* then his message, *the religion he taught?* His dynamic personality and his prophet-like abandon to the cause of God were his chief characteristics. The Christians expected him to return and therefore dwelt on his official dignity. The heroic picture of his person was destined to dominate that of the teacher. The "things said

and done" by him grew to miraculous proportions. He became the ideal sermonizer as well as the wonder-worker. By the end of the first century he became institutionalized, the head of the church and of the universe.

In reality his claims were much humbler. He proclaimed the Kingdom of God, i. e., that suddenly God would come to rescue his oppressed people. It is doubtful whether he predicted the fall of Jerusalem. But the present world order to him is worthless, and a new order is at hand. God is a God of mercy, love and watchful care, but also of anger and even vindictiveness. He will soon come to judgment. While waiting for the catastrophe we must practice righteousness. The ideals Jesus inculcated were practically impossible of realization, but they will be realized when the Kingdom of God has become an established fact. He who would do the will of God must sacrifice all, even life. His own loyalty to the ideals he preached carried him to the cross on Golgatha.

Such is in brief the argument of this book. It will be seen and admitted, we think, without controversy that it does *not* present in any sense, a *New Biography* of Jesus. It is occupied from start to finish with critical matter.

And the final result is most surprisingly meager.

Jesus is a prophet who proclaims the coming judgment and exhorts his generation to prepare for it by a change of heart and true obedience to God's will. That is all, absolutely all. He is no Messiah, no Saviour, he never rose from the dead, performed no miracle. He stands no nearer to God than any other prophet. His conception of God is as faulty as that of his O. T. fellow-prophets.

And this man has conquered the world! No, this man did not conquer the world; he never could have done any such thing. Christ conquered the world with his gospel, and there is not one ounce of gospel in the whole book. We have read many lives of Jesus, but few if any that take such liberties with Him and His biographers. The writer as an historical critic doubtless shows a good deal of research, but when he is through with his criticism he is absolutely bankrupt. What is left of Jesus is so little that it hardly justifies the labors required to write such a book. Unless the writer felt in conscience bound to tell us that Christianity is after all only a great illusion.

The writer sets out by saying that it is the duty of the historian to tell us which of the many current pictures of Jesus is correct. We reply that such is *not* the duty of the historian and never can be. It is, we readily admit, the duty of the historian to give us a true picture of the world in which Jesus lived, and also of the origin of the different gospels and their mutual relation as well as their dependence on earlier sources, as far as that is possible. But a reliable estimate of the person of Jesus a historian who has no other equipment but historical research, is unable to give. Augustine says, pectus facit theologum, and it is today conceded that a theologia irregenitorum is a contradictio in adjecto. Just so is an adequate appreciation of Jesus beyond the reach of mere historical research. A man without a musical ear can-

not produce or even appreciate music. The historian without the spiritual equipment of faith will never be a reliable guide in our thoughts about Jesus. Of course by saying that we are not posing as judge about Professor Case's spiritual state. But we do mean that a man's conception of Christ will always influence his attitude on the gospels as a record of what actually happened. If a scholar does not believe in the miraculous, or the divine nature of Christ; if Christ is to him a teacher but not a saviour; if he believes in the religion of Jesus, not the religion about him: then he will treat the records according to his belief or unbelief. We see this on every page of this book. The writer reads every tendency prevalent in Bible times into the gospels. According to him if the Christian missionaries needed miracles, they read them into the life of Jesus; if they needed a heaven-born saviour they invented the infancy stories; if they needed a Messiah they—or somebody—made Jesus a Messiah from the very first day of his life (gospel of John). It is astounding with what sangfroid Prof. Case can impute the most brazen fabrications to the makers or compilers of the gospel records.

The whole attempt of the writer to get at a true historical estimate of the life and person of Jesus by research, was foredoomed to failure from the very start, for the simple reason that it was impossible to get the "ipsissima verba" of Christ or a wholly impartial account of his life from any source. All available sources are already "interpretations". Their writers were already believers and they squared their reports with their beliefs. They could not do otherwise: "they spoke as they believed." Not even the most thorough-going research can get around that fact.

Mr. Case's book will in its historical portions be read with interest and profit; as an interpretation of the life of Jesus it is an absolute fiasco.

The Eloquence of Christian Experience, by *Raymond Calkins.* The Macmillan Co.—New York, 1927. 232 pages.

It was the Reviewer of the "Christian Century" that called our attention to this book. He did us no mean service for we found in it a rich fare of spiritual meat. The title is not quite adequate; one would expect from it in the main a discussion of the effect of spiritual experience on preaching. It is not that at all; it makes experience central in every phase of the minister's life. Therefore "the position of Christian experience in the minister's life" would be a more appropriate title. But the fact that the contents were to be used for the "Yale Lectures on *Preaching*" in 1926, probably accounts for the wording used by the author.

The writer holds that the deepest demand of the human mind is that for religious certainty. The Roman Catholic finds this in an infallible church; the Anglican in an authenticated priesthood; to the Protestant a certified history is the scientific basis of Christianity. By this last statement he means that the Protestant finds the ground of

his religious certainty in the person and life of Jesus, of which the New Testament is the absolutely reliable record.

The reason that even the Protestant's position, thus expressed, is not sure, is according to Calkins that historical criticism has made many of the facts of Christ's life and many of his words doubtful. How can we rest certitude on things that are not sure from attack and perhaps, destruction. No, he says, our faith cannot be based on the historical facts of Christ's life. Historical facts in themselves have no religious values. It is for the historian to sift the facts from possibly legendary matter or later accretions. He goes so far as to even admit that the resurrection appearances might have been nothing but visions. He himself believes in the resurrection, but he does not consider it vital. The disciples came to believe that Christ's soul and spirit were alive. As though they had ever doubted that! He claims that there is no evidence in apostolic teaching that Christ's body itself was resuscitated. A strange assertion, indeed, in the face of 1 Cor. 15.

What, then, is it that gave the New Testament Christians the sense and tone of absolute certainty? It was the God-experience they received in Christ. God found them in Christ, and in Christ they found God. It was not his word or his miracles that convinced them but his spiritual influence. This influence produced in them faith, which was not a mere emotional outburst but the response of their total nature to the demands of the divine life.

If Calkins seems to yield too much to modern tendencies in the matter of the resurrection, he surprises us by taking a firm stand on the atonement. Christianity removes man from God by its emphasis on sin, and there is no other way for man to God's fellowship but by that redemption whereby God reconciled the world unto himself. Here he parts company with those who have raised the cry: back to Christ, away from Paul! He says even, the neglect of Paul is the gravest danger of our modern Christianity. Paul's preaching of the cross, i. e., that in and through Christ sin has been done away, is the central teaching of the apostles. "Pauline Christianity is primitive Christianity." We agree here fully with Calkins. Still, early apostolic teaching emphasized even more that the crucified Lord was raised from the dead, and if Calkins is so emphatic on the cross we can't understand how he can withhold his support from the resurrection, which was the father's vindication of the son and the cornerstone of the early faith. Nevertheless we are in complete accord with him when he refuses to listen to those who want us to go back to the "simple gospel" of synoptic ethics and discard Paul's teaching as so much theological ballast.

On the whole it may be said that the writer has too high an opinion of the historical critics. He says, let the critics decide which words of Christ are genuine and which are not. If we let them do that, pretty soon we should be in the slough of despond instead of on the rock of assurance. Has not Bultmann, one of the critics, told us only lately that we know hardly anything for certain about Christ's life and words. We say, again, what we said in the previous review, it is not

the function of the critic to tell us what can be believed about the words and facts of Christ's life. Not a single critic does his work without preconceived opinions. His spiritual attitude will in every case affect the position he takes on debated questions.

The author feels that himself. In speaking on the relation of Christian experience to theology, he says, "It may even be asked if pure historical criticism is possible in the case of Jesus." Yes, not only may it be asked but the question may be denied very strenuously, what e. g. may pure historical criticism say about the deity of Christ, or the Trinity? The author says these questions can only be answered by the way of spiritual experience; they play a part in a man's spiritual development; they have been found to answer spiritual needs. We may be unable to give an explanation of them that meets all objections, but perhaps only because "our intellectual comprehensions are too narrow for our spiritual necessities" (A. Balfour). Not that church whose theology is the most consistent but whose religion meets the whole moral emergency, will grow. America is not waiting for a liberalized theology with all the old Bible elements drained out of it. She is waiting for a theology that utters the realities of the New Testament experience of God in the thought forms of this modern age.

We cannot go on quoting from the closing chapters (the "Preachers" and the "Pastor") as we would like to. All the author says is grouped around his main thesis that the experience of God in Christ is the one vital requisite, etc., of the minister. No Pietist could be more insistent on the personal faith of the pastor; the whole Erlanger school could not bring the need and importance of the new birth into stronger relief.

No recent author has more consistently sought to make the spiritual equipment of the minister the conditio sine qua non. Calkins is in cordial sympathy with the recent trend towards mysticism. He even advocates certain methods of cultivating the mystical attitude. He is no obscurantist, he is also aware of the far-reaching social implications of the gospel. However, first and last and all the time, he is for a personal, thorough and growing experience of God in Christ. With this, all problems will ultimately be solved; without it, all the minister's efforts will go for nought.

The American Pulpit. A Volume of Sermons by Twenty-five of the Foremost Living American Preachers, Chosen by a Poll of All the Protestant Ministers in the United States, Nearly 25,000 of Whom Cast their Votes. Edited by Chas. Clayton Morrison, Editor "The Christian Century." The Macmillan Company. 1925. 384 pages.

It might have been better if we had reviewed this book when it came out two years ago and every one wondered what kind of sermons the men produced who, by a vote of their colleagues, had been placed at the head of their profession. Still, the book is by no means old now, and it will give its readers not only an idea of what kind of spiritual food these distinguished ministers set before their folks but also reflect

the prevailing outlook and faith of the church. The editor says that the church's mind is in a large measure the creation of its ministers by their preaching. We may receive this statement with a goodly amount of qualification; but if, as in this case, the selection of preachers was made by men "of all groups and schools of theological thought in all denominations," it seems indeed very likely that the twenty-five leaders chosen are the real interpreters of the mind of the church today.

In our review we can, of course, discuss only a few of the twenty-five, and our discussion of the few will be largely in the nature of marginal notes.

The most outstanding man of the whole group is *Dr. Cadman*, the president of the Federal Council and the pastor of Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn. He preaches a very unusual sermon from an unusual text, 1 Cor. 3: 12-13: "If any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble . . . . the day shall declare it, because it is revealed by fire." He tries to bring out the idea that believing men and women determine, by their work and character, the degree of their immortal blessedness. The hereafter is a democracy of opportunity and an aristocracy of character. One should therefore not confront the mystery of the other life without an equipment of all possible godliness in character and deed. Redemption of time, sagacious selection of material, painstaking labor from unmixed motives in its shaping and use, the cultivation of a conscience void of offense, an experimental realization of the truths we communicate—these are the lines along which the development of Christian character should proceed.

The sermon is compact with thought, original in treatment and in Cadman's characteristic style. It is not a sermon for an ordinary audience; it demands close and sustained attention.

The sermons of the book are hardly ever of an expository character. The great majority is of the topical kind and the texts used are always very brief, sometimes consisting of clauses only. *Henry Sloane Coffin*, e. g., has one on "To enter into life" (Mark 9: 43). He preaches on that an "evolutionary" sermon, showing that life in passing from the water to the earth, from plants to animals and men had to make tremendous efforts to adapt itself to changed and higher forms. What was involved in this? 1) a new breathing apparatus; 2) an improved method of motion; 3) a new protection for the body; 4) a new family and social life. Then he goes on to point out that for man to pass "from the natural to the spiritual" (the subject of the sermon) required closely parallel developments. Thereupon he elucidates the phases of this development adhering minutely to the biological changes mentioned. A "finer breathing apparatus." We "accustom ourselves to the atmosphere of the New Testament (the spirit of trust, hope and love) by frequent excursions to it and by thinking out our questions in it." And so on. We have never seen a more thoroughly evolutionary sermon than this. An audience of students may perhaps relish this; the taste of ordinary church goers would possibly be different.

But the sermon shows great homiletic skill, in addition to accurate scientific information.

Charles W. Gilkey, of the Hyde Park Baptist Church of Chicago (the University of Chicago is at the center of his parish), offers a sermon on psalm 121: 8 ("the Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in"). The title is "Journeys out and home." He means the spiritual and moral adventures of the spirit of those who are not confused by creed, orthodoxy or a hallowed past; who have new visions, see new tasks and seek to live up to them in the faith of him whose fulness and adequacy are never found wanting. It is to be an Easter sermon, but the strange thing is he never even mentions the resurrection of Christ and seems to base the hope of immortality rather on the victorious nature of faith than on the historical fact of the rising of Christ, the head of the new community (cp. Peter: "He has begotten us again by the resurrection of Christ unto a living hope"). One can imagine what it would be to become acquainted with men like the ones mentioned, or with the late Russell Conwell; Geo. A. Gordon, of Boston; L. H. Hough, of Detroit; Chas. E. Jefferson; Merton L. Rice; Timothy Stone, and others; to see and hear them. Only few can have this privilege. In this book, however, you get in touch with them. You don't only hear them. Short biographical sketches tell you of their development and work. The book is an interesting one to have and to read; and doubtless the reader will know a good deal more of the "mind of the church" and the problems of the time after a thoughtful perusal of the volume.

Das Sittliche. Eine Weiterführung des Kantischen Grundgedankens von **Eduard Grimm.** Göttingen, Vandenhoek & Ruprecht 1928. 169 S., 6 Mk., geb. Mk. 7.50.

In der sittlichen Anarchie der Nachkriegszeit, wie sie in allen Ländern nur zu augenfällig ist, gilt es, eine Welt- und Lebensanschauung zu finden, die die zentrifugalen Kräfte des Menschengetriebes in ihren Kreis bannt. Der Verfasser findet dieselbe in der Kantschen Sittenlehre. Das, was dem Geschlecht unsrer Tage dringend nötig ist, ist eine Rückkehr zu dem Weisen von Königsberg. Wie das Evangelium von Christo eine stets frisch rauschende Quelle zur religiösen Erneurung der Menschheit ist, so — oder beinahe so — ist die „Kritik der praktischen Vernunft" ein noch unausgeschöpfter Born sittlicher Belebung. Verfasser denkt zwar, den Kantschen Grundgedanken „weiter geführt" zu haben, doch scheint er uns nicht wesentlich über seinen Philosophen hinausgegangen zu sein.

Kant war der erste, der das Sittliche in seiner hehren Größe und seiner unbedingten Autorität entdeckt hat. Er löst es von allen Bindungen an das bloß Nützliche oder Angenehme, sowie von allem bloß historisch Gewordenen. Er findet es in dem Busen des Menschen selbst. Dort herrscht es als ein unbedingter Imperativ. Seine Autorität entlehnt es nicht von etwas außer dem Menschen Bestehenden, auch nicht von einem göttlichen Gebot. Der Mensch vermöge seiner praktischen Vernunft, d. h. der Seite seines Wesens, die sein Verhalten und seine Gesinnung bestimmt, gibt es sich selbst. Es ist daher autonom, nicht heteronom; und weil es autonom

ist, ist es ein Gesetz der Freiheit. Der Mensch kann sich dagegen auflehnen, aber dann handelt er gegen sein eigenes Wesen, gegen sein eigenes sittliches Bewußtsein. Aus der Tatsache der Autonomie folgt die Pflicht des Gehorsams, das Bewußtsein der Verantwortlichkeit. Es gibt vor diesem Gesetz kein Entrinnen, kein Vorwenden menschlicher Schwachheit oder Unwissenheit. Es ist ein kategorischer Imperativ. Es sagt klar und unmißverständlich: Du sollst! Und weil du sollst, darum kannst du auch.

Es ist eitel, dem Ursprung dieses merkwürdigen Imperativs nachzudenken. Alles Grübeln und Forschen führt nicht weiter: Er ist ein unabweisliches, wenn auch unerklärliches, **Faktum** unsers persönlichen Lebens; das ist alles, was man drüber sagen kann. Verfasser führt dann noch aus, was für sittliche Regeln aus dem Dasein dieses sittlichen Bewußtseins sich ergeben. („Handle so, daß dein Handeln ein Maxim für alle andern werden könnte" usw.).

Auch zeigt er den Platz, den Kant der **Religion** im sittlichen Leben anweist. Aus der Tatsache, daß dasselbe hier immer mit Unvollkommenheit behaftet ist, folgert K., daß es ein Jenseits geben müsse, wo sich die Entwicklung fortsetzt. Aus der Erhabenheit der sittlichen Forderung ergibt sich, daß einmal und irgendwie das Sollen zum wirklichen Können und Sein werden muß. Und aus dem Zwiespalt zwischen Naturlauf und sittlichem Leben wird gefolgert, daß es eine Kraft gebe, welche ebenso den Naturlauf beherrsche, wie den Erfolg des sittlichen Lebens verbürge. Diese Kraft nennen wir Gott. Gott und das Sittengesetz sind wesentlich ein und dasselbe. Ihm legen wir nicht nur absolute Vollkommenheit, sondern auch die Macht bei, sittliche Würde und äußeres Schicksal in Einklang zu bringen.

Auf diese Weise gelangt Kant zum Glauben an die Unsterblichkeit des Geistes und an das Dasein Gottes. Es sind **Postulate,** die sich aus dem Sittengesetz ergeben. Man beachte, das Sittengesetz ist das ursprüngliche, absolut feststehende, alles andre tragende Faktum, die andern Dinge sind Forderungen, die wir kraft jener sittlichen Tatsache erheben.

Auf Grund dieser Erörterungen über die formale Seite des Sittlichen, schreitet Verfasser nun fort zur Betrachtung des Sittlichen nach seinem **Inhalt.** Er bespricht den Menschen an und für sich und in seinem Verhältnis zu den Mitmenschen (Gerechtigkeit, Liebe); Intuition, Streben nach Glück und das letzte Ziel. Sodann das Sittliche im sozialen Leben (wobei er merkwürdig weniges über die brennende Frage von Kapital und Arbeit zu sagen hat). Dann vom Bösen und seiner Bekämpfung. Der Böse ist das Tierische im Menschen. Er hat ursprünglich auf einer niedrigen Stufe gestanden, und das Tierische haftet ihm noch an von daher. Schließlich, im letzten Kapitel wendet er sich dem Verhältnis von Ethik und Religion zu. Er hat „absichtlich" die Religion bisher aus dem Spiel gelassen. Dennoch strebt der sittliche Mensch zu einem religiösen Glauben: 1. Weil, wenn er Gott zum Bürgen des Sittengesetzes macht, das Gesetz seines Gewissens zum obersten Weltgesetz gemacht wird und dadurch gesteigerte Würde erhält, 2. weil der Gottesglaube zu einer einheitlichen Weltanschauung führt: die Macht, die im Gewissen sich betätigt, wirkt zugleich in den Naturgewalten, 3. die Fragen von Schuld, Vergebung, Erlösung finden nur in einem persönlichen Gott ihre Beantwortung. Hier ist das weitere der Religion (theol. Ethik) zu überlassen.

Die Besprechung aller dieser so eminent praktischen Materien wird mit eindringender Schärfe geführt und in durchaus klarer, lichtvoller Sprache. Der Verfasser ist ein Jünger Kants, aber er hat den schweren Panzer Kantischer Terminologie abgelegt.

Eine gewisse Trockenheit des Tons konnte bei den sich strikt im Gebiet des Moralischen haltenden Gedankengängen des Buches kaum vermieden werden. Grimm hat das auch selbst gefühlt, daher stellt er das Wort des Apostels, 1. Kor. 15, 34: „Werdet doch einmal recht nüchtern!" als Motto und als eine Art Selbstverteidigung an die Spitze.

Was nun das Buch als ganzes anbelangt und des Verfassers Bemühen, durch eine Rückkehr zu Kant das sittliche Leben des jetzigen Geschlechts zu heben, so geben wir ohne weiteres zu, daß eine gute Portion von Kantischem Ernst ein dringendes Erfordernis der Zeit wäre. Eine andre Frage ist, ob wir solches durch das Studium Kants und auf Kants Weise erreichen würden. Für das Land und Volk, dem Rezensent angehört, muß diese Frage ohne weiteres verneint werden. Hier würde die schroffe Einseitigkeit des katagorischen Imperativs, die von Neigung, Glück, Erfolg, Nutzen geflissentlich absieht, gar kein Verständnis finden. Auch würde die soziologische Tendenz der Zeit sich nicht mit der sittlichen Forderung als einem einfachen Faktum begnügen, sondern auf ihre vielfach historisch beeinflußte Entwicklung den Finger legen. Schließlich beschäftigt sich Kants Kritik wesentlich mit der formalen Seite des Sittlichen, und wenn irgend ein Volk, dann ist es unsers, das Belehrung in konkreter, anschaulicher, lebensvoller Form begehrt, nicht in abstrakten, allgemeinen Vernunftgedanken.

Auch in Deutschland, glauben wir, wird Kants Sittenlehre nur einzelne erreichen. Diese einzelnen freilich, so könnte man sagen, können ihn dann den vielen vermitteln. Wir halten es für ein aussichtsloses Bemühen. Bei Kant ist der lebendige Nerv der Religion die Moral. Die religiösen Dinge sind nur sittliche Postulate. Gottes wird man bewußt durch eine Operation der praktischen Vernunft. Wir sind der Ueberzeugung, daß man seiner auf die Weise überhaupt nicht **bewußt** wird, man kann ihn so nur **annehmen**, postulieren. Kants Ehrfurcht, seine Anbetung gehört dem Sittengesetz, nicht dem Gott, mit dem man persönlichen Verkehr hat.

Man kann eine Ethik, eine philosophische, ohne Religion aufrichten, wie viele Beispiele zeigen, von den Stoikern bis auf unsre Tage. Den Christen kann nur eine christliche Ethik befriedigen. Er kann nur eine Ethik aufbauen mit den theologischen Voraussetzungen, die in den Artikeln des Glaubensbekenntnisses umschrieben sind. Ihm ist Christus Beispiel, Norm und Quelle des sittlichen Lebens. Ihm ist der Glaube an ihn Bürgschaft, daß der christliche Geist Gestalt gewinnen wird im persönlichen und gesellschaftlichen Leben. Darum kann er die Besprechung der Religion nicht bis auf das letzte Kapitel verschieben. Mit dieser Bemerkung wollen wir dem Verfasser nicht den christlichen Glauben absprechen. Wir sagen nur, sein Weg ist für uns nicht gangbar.

Im Ganzen, des **Volkslebens** insonderheit wird helfen weder Kraut noch Pflaster irgend welcher Art, weder antiker noch moderner Stoizismus, es hilft nur das Evangelium, nur christlicher Gottesglaube, der zu allem Wollen das Können verleiht und in aller Finsternis nicht die Hoffnung aufgibt, die sich auf Verheißung stützt.